3468
16.3.85

EDUCATION IN RURAL AREAS

A. S. SEETHARAMU
M. D. USHADEVI

S.C.E.R.T., West Bengal
Library
Calcutta
25/3, B. C. Road

ASHISH PUBLISHING HOUSE
8/81, PUNJABI BAGH
NEW DELHI-110026

Published by :
S.B. Nangia
for Ashish Publishing House,
8/81, Punjabi Bagh,
New Delhi-110026
Tel. 500581

This study was sponsored by the Department of Women and Children's Welfare, Government of Karnataka and financed by the UNICEF, as one of the activities for the year 1979, declared as the 'International Year of the Child.'

© Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore
1985

S.C.E.R.T. West Bengal
Dat 16.3.85
Acc. No... 3168

371.2913
SEE

3168
KRay

Printed at :
National Printers
20/3, West Patel Nagar,
New Delhi-110008
Tel. 582828

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The year 1979 was declared by the United Nations as the 'International Year of the Child'. The purpose of the U N in doing so was to focus the attention of the world on the problems concerning the welfare of children all over the world and concentrate specifically on working towards the goal. Following this long felt need, the UNICEF, a wing of the U N exclusively devoted to child welfare, committed, to give a large sum to India during 1977 for preparatory activities for the I Y C. A part of this money was diverted to the Department of Women and Children's Welfare of the Government of Karnataka. A meeting was held at the Department on 24.1.1977 and it was decided in this meeting, apart from other things, to encourage research on child welfare. In the middle of January 1978, the Department of Women and Children's Welfare invited research proposals on identified priority areas from research Institutions including the Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore. ISEC sent its proposal by the end of February 1978. This proposal was discussed at various levels right from discussions within the Institute through the meetings of the Department of Women and Children's Welfare and upto the UNICEF expert committees. It underwent several revisions and refinments. It could be ultimately finalised by the end of April 1980. The work began in May 1980.

The study on school drop-outs in rural areas is a Macro study covering 80 schools and 62 villages drawn from ten talukas of five different regions of the State with contrasting rates of participation of children in schooling. In all, 1878 households and 80 schools have been covered. The purpose has been to diagnose the problems of school participation in the context of age, sex, regional, ecological backgrounds, family and school variables etc. This is an in-depth diagnostic analysis of the problem. Policy imperatives are derived from empirical data collected in the study.

Being a Macro study the organisation and management of work is quite complex and involved the unflinching co-operation of several individuals and institutions. We would like to formally express our gratitude to the assistance we have received from these sources.

We are grateful to the Department of Women and Children's Welfare who sponsored this project and through them the UNICEF for making available considerable financial grant for conducting the project. We thank in particular Mrs Shanthakumari Devaraj, IAS, and Mrs Usha Ganesh, IAS, the two successive Directors of the Department of Women and Children's Welfare, Government of Karnataka during the period of operation of the project, for their constant support.

We thank Dr A C Deve Gowda, Dr (Mrs) Devaki Jain and Mr Alexander, IAS, who served as experts on the Advisory Committee set up for the project and who offered valuable suggestions in planning and executing the work.

We also thank the UNICEF experts, Mr Ramanath C Dore, UNICEF Resident Programme Officer in South India, Madras, Dr M N Kulkarni and Dr (Mrs) Padmini Ramaswamy, both of the planning section, UNICEF, New Delhi for their expert opinions on the project proposals and their interest in the project.

We thank Prof S R Rohidekar, Head, Education Unit for his constant encouragement and all out support for successful completion of the project. We also thank Dr P M Kulkarni, Associate Professor, at the Population Research Centre of our Institute who gave us ever willing advice on the design and organisation of field work and analysis of data when it was sought for.

We thank the Director of the ISEC, Dr L S Venkataramanan and his supporting staff for providing us with all the facilities in the smooth conduct of the work.

We thank the Director, Primary Education, Government of Karnataka, the ADPI, Statistical Cell, Office of the CPI, the DDPI's of the Districts covered and the Assistant Educational Officers of the talukas covered who extended their full support in the conduct of the field work. We would like to specially acknowledge the services rendered by the Head Masters and Teachers of Primary Schools (in several cases they were Teacher-*cum*-Head Masters of single teacher schools) for their co-operation in doing the study.

We would like to place on record our grateful thanks to the parents of the 1878 drop-out children covered without whose co-operation the study would not have been possible.

Thirteen field investigators worked for the project for varying periods from 20 days to 7 months. We would like to thank them individually for their painstaking and persevering efforts in spite of several hardships of living in rural areas.

We are highly grateful to Dr D V Chickermane, Director, Research Centre in Rural Education, Gokarn and Dr K Venkatasubramanian, formerly Director of Education and Chairman, Board of Higher Secondary Education, Tamil Nadu, Madras, who were kind enough to review the study and offer several suggestions that helped us to improve the quality of this report.

Finally, we thank our colleagues in the Education Unit for the useful suggestions that we got from them through our informal discussions. We thank Mr B R Prakash, Typist of our unit for typing the report.

Bangalore

A.S. Seetharamu
M.D. Usha Devi

CONTENTS

Pages

Acknowledgements (iii)

List of Tables (ix)

Chapter I

Story of the School-Leavers 1—12

Chater II

School Drop-outs in Rural Areas 13 - 26

Chapter III

Family Background of Drop-outs 27—43

Chapter IV

The Drop-out's World 44—59

Chapter V

Non-School Factors 60—70

Chapter VI

School Facilities : A Comparative Analysis of Low and High Drop-out Areas as well as Different Regions in the State 71—90

Chapter VII

Highlights and Policy Imperatives Non-School Factors 91—116

Tables 117—188

Appendices 189—217

Index 218—220

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	*Titles of Tables*	*Pages*
1	Standard-wise Drop-out behaviour of Boys and Girls in Karnataka State	16
2	Master Table of Drop-out Phenomenon in the State (showing regional high-low, sex and standard-wise variations)	117-118
3	Standard-wise Drop-out in Different Regions of the State	119
4	Standard-wise Drop-out in Low and High Drop-out Areas	119
5	Sex-variations in Standard-wise Drop-out in Different Regions of the State	120
6	Standard-wise Sex-variations in High and Low Drop-out Areas	121
7	Perceptions of Parents about the Performance of their Children Before or at the Time of Leaving School	25
8	Region-wise Percentage of Drop-outs in High-Low Drop-out Areas who did not Learn Anything at School and Who Dropped out at I and II Standards	121
9	Education of Fathers of Drop-outs Showing Regional and Low-High Variations	122-123
10	Education of Mothers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise Variation	124
11	Educational Attainment of Family Members	125-127

Table No.	*Titles of Tables*	*Pages*
12	Occupation of Fathers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations	128-129
13	Statement Showing Regional Variations Between Low and High Drop-out Talukas with Respect to Nature of Occupation of Fathers of Drop-out Children	130
14	Occupations of Mothers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations	131-132
15	Size of Land-holding of Fathers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations	133
16	Number of Drop-outs from Families where Father and Mother are Employed	134-135
17	Income of the Fathers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations	136-137
18	Mean Income, Median Income, Standard Deviation of Income and Skewness in the Distribution of Income of Fathers of Drop-outs for Different Regions in the State, Low-High Variations therein and the State as a Whole	138
19	Income of the Mothers of Drop-out Showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations	139-140
20	Social Background of Drop-outs in the State including Low-High and Regional Variations	141
21	Duties of Drop-out Relating to Home Management (Inside the Home) Covering Regional, Low-High and Sex-Variations	142-147
22	Duties of Drop-out Outside the Home with Regional, Low-High and Sex-Variations	148-151
23	Sex-wise Distribution of Drop-outs in Low-High Drop-out Areas in Different Regions of the State Engaged in Out-of-home Domestic Duties During Morning, Afternoon and Evening Times of the Day	152-155

Table No.	*Titles of Tables*	*Pages*
24	Number of Hours of Work Put in by Drop-outs in Discharge of Domestic Duties Either Inside the Home of Outside Covering Regional, Low-High and Sex-Variations	156-159
25	Distribution of Participation of Drop-outs in Paid Agricultural and Non-agricultural Labour Covering Regional, Low-High and Sex Variations	160-163
26	Annual Income of Drop-outs in Paid Agricultural Labour Covering Regional Low-High and Sex Variations	164-167
27	Monthly Income of Drop-outs Engaged in Paid Non-agricultural Labour Covering Regional, Low-High and Sex Variations	168-171
28	Mean and Median Annual Income of Drop-outs in Paid Agricultural Work Showing Regional and Low-High and Sex Variations	172
29	Child Labour and Drop-out Phenomenon in Karnataka State (Rural)	173
30	Rural Marriage Data on Drop-out Girls Covering Regional and Low-High Variations	174-181
31	Reasons for Withdrawal of Children from Schools as reported by the parents covering Regional, Low-High and Sex Variations	182-185
32	Number of Schools and Teachers in Low-High Drop-out Areas	186
33	Teacher-Pupil Ratio in Low-High Drop-out Areas	187
34	Enrolment Figures in Primary Schools of Low and High Drop-out Areas	187
35	Incentives Schemes in Force During 1979-80 in Schools of Low and High Drop-out Areas	188

CHAPTER I

STORY OF THE SCHOOL-LEAVERS

Introduction

There is a story that eight blind men wanted to know the answer to a question they put for themselves : "What is an elephant ?" They decided that instead of discussing in a vacuum about an elephant it is better to go and feel the elephant. They all set themselves about the task and began to feel the elephant. Each one of them touched and felt different parts of the elephant. When they returned and tried to answer the question, one of them who had touched the tail said that elephant is a tail, another one who had touched the trunk said that elephant is like the trunk of a big tree, similarly the others described the elephant as the part they had individually felt. The one did not agree with the other and there was a prolonged discussion which did not lead them to any conclusion. Later a passer by with vision and who saw the elephant and met these blind people intervened to tell them that all of them were correct but partially so. He impressed upon them the need to look at the data they had collected earlier in an integral way and then test the same and confirm their understanding. This is what they did later and got a fairly clear understanding of the elephant.

Following this story it is observed that a similar story holds good about research on school drop-outs. There have been several studies of school drop-outs. A review of these studies follows later. It is essential to forewarn that it is not suggested here that earlier researchers had no vision, were like blind men, etc. To think on those lines is to carry the simile in the story of the blind men and the elephant too far. The studies referred to are very important milestones in the direction of the solutions to the problem of drop-out phenomenon. But all these studies have individually highlighted one or the other problems children have in attending school or parents have in sending them to school or the schools have in attracting children. Quite a few studies have concluded that 'poverty' is a major reason for school drop-outs. In other words parents withhold children from school or withdraw them later because they are poor. Some reseachers have highlighted the availability of labour for children as a factor for school drop-outs phenomenon. When labour is available parents would feel that child in the field or on the farm is more productive than a child in the school. Some studies have concluded that poverty of culture as reflected in the educational background of parents, of the family in general or the habits the family has with respect to schooling as of greater importance than other reasons. Similarly there are other reasons also advanced as instrumental in the withdrawal of children from school. But all these studies, by and large, appear to have looked at the problem in a piece-meal fashion and not in its larger rural ecological context. So far there has been no integrated approach to look at drop-out phenomenon. An attempt to look at the life of the child in rural areas in its totality rather than just as related to schooling is still wanting. The present study is an attempt to provide an integral perspective on the life of the drop-out in rural areas. The plan is to analyse the life of the drop-out with a view to derive policy implications for controlling drop-out phenomenon.

REVIEW OF STUDIES IN THE FIELD

Review of Previous Work and Need for the Study

Looking at the educational situation in India and Karnataka it is seen that the Constitution of India envisaged, as per directive principles, the achievement of universal Compulsory Education for children in the age group of 6-14 years within a period of 10 years from the date of its inception *i.e.,* by 1960. While eight States, of which Karnataka is one, have achieved considerable progress in the matter of enrolment of children at the I standard level, there has been a high drop-out rate especially in the first four years as a result of which universal primary education has remained a distant dream.

Karnataka State introduced compulsory Primary Education in the age group 6-11 years in 1961. The overall enrolment rate in this age group has gone as high as 98%.[1a] But the actual number completing four years of primary education is less than 33%. About 35% drop-out in the first two years. The drop-out rates at the end of four years for boys and girls are 68.34% and 78.45% respectively.

It is obvious that the drop-out rates are alarmingly high. Karnataka is one of the eleven States which fall below the national average in drop-out rates.

Outlay on Primary Education in India is increasing steadily from one plan period to another plan period.[1b] Even in Karnataka State the expenditure and per pupil cost of primary education are steadily increasing though it is among the 13 States which fall below the national average.[2]

The school drop-out phenomenon is a nation wide problem as is indicated by the comprehensive study by C L Sapra on "Educational Wastage and Stagnation in India" (NCERT 1967) using True Cohort method. His study shows that the wastage incidence is 75.09% in the case of boys and 84.74% in the case of girls. It is highest in Grade I and then goes on decreasing.

There have been numerous studies related to wastage and stagnation in primary schools. Right from the Hartog Committee report of 1929 through the series of studies of the research unit of the Bombay Municipal Corporation (1955[a] 1956[b] 1957[c] 1958[d] 1967[e])[3], the Satara studies (1953)[4] the study by the Planning Commission (1965)[5] and studies by C L Sapra (1967, 1972)[6], D S Rawat and S L Gupta (1970)[7], M Jayaraman (1967)[8], UNESCO (1970)[9] to studies by Khandekar M[10], Mrs Chandrashekharan (1978)[11] and Sushila Bai (1979)[12] there have been innumerable studies on wastage in primary education.

The most common causes revealed by a large number of studies are ; Poverty and indifference of parents, need for children to be engaged in domestic work, need for them to do paid work and supplement family income, irrelevant education, want of instructional materials, etc. The causes vary from region to region and their relative importance also varies from study to study.

A study of drop-out behaviour was done by A S Seetharamu[13] (Director of the Present Study) also. The focus of the study was on utilisation of educational facilities with specific reference to slum-dwellers of Bangalore City. It was a comparative study of 500 regularly attending children and 500 drop-outs (not attending school is also non-utilisation of an educational facility. Attendance is essential for further utilisation). The objective was to look at their social and economic backgrounds, demographic profiles of the families to which they belonged, whereabout of drop-outs, degree and problems of utilisation etc. In the light of the results of the study, measures were suggested to retain school-leavers, to ensure full and proper utilisation of educational facilities and to solve problems faced by slum-dwellers in their effective participation in the schooling process.

Operational Definition of Terms Used

Two key terms need to be defined in the study of "School Drop-outs in Rulal Areas." One is 'drop-out' and the other is 'rural areas'.

A drop-out is defined as a child who after having enrolled into a primary school left it before completing the full term of seven years of primary education. The child might have left school immediately after enrolment, before completing the first year, after completing Standard I, II, III, IV, V or VI, or any other time during the course of these standards. Further, a child who dropped-out in the previous standard should not have been re-admitted or continue to attend school during the time of study. In other words, the child should be a confirmed school-leaver.

This is because, at present, a child's name will not be struck off from the attendance register for a period of seven years from the date of admission to the first standard of primary education whether he attends the school or absents himself thereafter. In other words, a long absentee during the previous year/years and not attending the current year (the year of study) also has not taken a transfer certificate from the school was a confirmed school-leaver. Only such children were taken as drop-outs for the study.

Rural Area

The census definition of rural area was considered for the study. The classification of areas as rural or urban was made following the District Census Handbooks. However, wet and dry areas were classified on the basis of assured source of water and rainfall.

Objectives of the Study

The chief purpose with which this study is taken is to provide an integral perspective on the problem of school drop-outs in rural areas. The various objectives of specificity and detail that will constitute the integrated outlook are listed below :

(*a*) To diagnose problems of participation in school,

(*b*) To compare factors favourable for school participation in low and high drop-out areas as well as different regions of the State,

(*c*) To analyse the problem of drop-outs in the context of school variables,

(*d*) To analyse the problem of drop-outs in the context of family variables,

(*e*) To study the relation between child labour and drop-out behaviour,

(*f*) To analyse the problem of drop-outs in the context of the larger environmental/socio-economic setting.

Sex variations in the analyses of drop-out phenomenon are invariably highlighted.

Methodology

Document analysis and Interview-techniques have been adopted to collect data for the study. Data on school varibles have been collected from the records maintained by the schools in the sampled villages. Data on family and other variables have been collected from the parents of drop-outs through the interview-techniques. School-information schedule and parents' interview schedule had been prepared for the purpose.

Sample-Design for the Study

Regions

Problems of education are region-specific. This is specifically true of problems of participation in schools. As such, to study drop-out behaviour in the various regions of Karnataka, the State has been classified into five regions namely, wet land areas, dry land areas, coastal areas, malnad areas or hilly tracts and industrially concentrated pockets. There are 186 talukas in Karnataka State. They are distributed to the five regions classified here depending upon the ecological features.

Talukas : (Blocks)

Drop-out data for the 186 talukas and for the year 1979-80 have been collected from the Department of Public Instruction. On the basis of drop-out data analysis, the talukas in the five regions are ranked in descending order of drop-out rates. Two talukas, one with highest drop-out rates and the other lowest drop-out rates are selected in each region category. As such 10 talukas are obtained from five regions. The low and high drop-out talukas are selected so as to make a comparison of factors favourable and unfavourable to participation in school.

Villages

In the next stage, villages are to be selected. Data about the universe of study, that is drop-out data at village level is available only at the taluka educational offices and it is a time-consuming exercise to collect and analyse village-level data. As such, two variables, namely educational facility and size of the village defined in terms of number of households are taken to be proxies for the drop-out data. As such, villages in the ten selected talukas are stratified into three categories, namely, those having primary school facility, middle school facility and secondary school facility. Related villages with no schooling facility will be incidentally covered under the first category. Again these villages are reclassified on the basis of size of villages. Depending upon the total number of villages in each category, either one village or two villages are taken. If the total number of villages in a category is small, the Median village is selected. If the total number is quite high, then a cut off point is considered and the Median village above and the Median village below the cut off points are selected. In a few cases three villages have been selected as the total number of villages in the category is very high. The cut off points have to be kept floating from taluka to taluka and from category to category depending upon the number of villages in each category. In this way a total number of 62 villages have been selected for the final study.

Thus, information was collected from 80 schools and 1878 families in these 62 villages. The following information were collected :

Information with respect to family background of drop-outs included parental social and economic background, demographic composition at family-level, participation of children in paid labour, involvement of children in home management, parental awareness of school facilities and educational incentives etc., (for more details refer Appendix-I). And the information with regard to school variables included Teachers' strength, sex, training, residence and experience of teachers, building and equipment, accommodation, community participation, facilities for physical education and play, incentive schemes, co-curricular activities, assets etc. (for more details refer Appendix-II).

Organisation of Pilot-Study and Field Work

A preliminary survey was carried out in the initial stages of the project in two villages of Doddaballapur taluka which was found to have highest drop-out rate in Bangalore District. The object of conducting this survey was to get an insight into the problems of school drop-outs in rural areas and to plan exhaustive and comprehensive tools to collect data for the study.

In the next stage all 186 talukas in the State were classified into five regions *viz.*, Dry, Wet, Coastal, Hilly and Industrial Belts. And from each region two talukas, one with highest drop-out rate and the other with lowest drop-out rate were selected for the main study. However, for pilot study Coondapur and Karkala Talukas in Coastal regions, Shorapur and Deodurg in Dry region, Virajpet in Hilly region and Magadi in Industrial Belt region were covered. Wet region was not covered in the pilot study as there were floods in selected villages of the selected taluka (Kollegal) at the time of pilot study and it was not approachable.

In the pilot-survey altogether over 100 households and 10 schools were visited to collect the data (for more details refer Appendix-III).

Data collected and analysed from the survey helped in refining the tools and organising the field work.

The field work was organised soon after the sample of ten talukas in five different regions of the State was selected based on their low and high drop-out rates (refer Appendix-IV for further details).. The field investigators were paired in two's and the ten talukas were distributed among three such teams of the investigators each. Each team covered 3 talukas totalling nine talukas. One more taluka (the Nelamangala taluka) was covered in the beginning itself by all the field investigators along with the field supervisors and the Project Director. This plan provided an opportunity to train the investigators also in data collection and help them sense the problems therein. A one-week orientation covering objectives of the survey, conceptual perspectives, methods of data collection, simulated interviews etc., was provided for the investigators before they were sent to the field (refer Appendix-VI).

The field work was supervised through 'pleasant-surprise-visits' by the project supervisor and project director, intermittantly but throughout the period of data collection.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. (*a*) Figures from statistical Brochures 1969-70 to 75-76 Department of Public Instruction, Govt. of Karnataka.

   (*b*) Outlay on primary education in India (Rs. in crores)

I plan	II plan	III plan	Annual plan
93	93	209	74.07
IV plan	V plan	VI plan	
256	410	900	

2. Bhatia Om Prakash : "Inter-State and Inter-regional variations in Educational Wastage in India." The study corroborates Blaug's observation that in India educational expenditure as well as educational wastage are increasing.

3. Bombay Municipal Corporation :

   (Research Unit) :

   (*a*) "Report on the study of the incidence of wastage and stagnation in municipal schools and the effectiveness of our educational efforts," 1955.

   (*b*) "The incidence of drop-outs in primary schools in Worli for six months between September 1955 and February 1956 and the factors responsible for the same," 1956.

(*c*) "A study of the extent and causes of non-attendance of compulsory age children in the different localities in Greater Bombay," 1957.

(*d*) "Observation of the Census of Compulsory age-group children conducted by the Education Department (in Worli)," 1958.

(*e*) "A study of the incidence of wastage and stagnation and the effectiveness of our educational efforts," 1967.

4. (*a*) Dandekar V M : "Investigation into wastage and Stagnation in Primary Education in Satara District," Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune, 1953.

(*b*) Gadgil G R and Dandekar V M : "Report of two Investigations, Primary Education in Satara District", Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune, 1953.

5. Planning Commission — Programme Evaluation Organisation : "Problem of Extension of Primary Education in Rural Areas", New Delhi, 1965.

6. (*a*) Sapra C L : "Educational Wastage and Stagnation in India," NCERT, 1967.

(*b*) Sapra C L : "Measurement of Educational Wastage," NCERT, 1972.

7. Rawat D S and Gupta S.L. : Educational Wastage at the Primary Schools," NCERT, 1970.

8. Jayaraman, M : "Stagnation and Wastage in Primary Schools," NCERT, 1967.

9. UNESCO : "The Statistical Measurement of Educational Wastage," 1970.

10. Khandekar M : "A Study of Drop-outs" TISS Bombay 1974, abstracted in Second Survey of Educational Research (ed), M B Buch, CASE, Baroda, 1979, p. 478.

11. Rajeshwari Chandrashekaran : "A Critical Study in Depth of the various measures taken by the Government of Karnataka in the Field of Primary Education during the period 1947-1972." Unpublished Ph D thesis, ISEC, (University of Mysore), 1978.

Mrs. Rajeshwari Chandrashekharan has computed district-wise average percentage figures of wastage among boys and girls in classes I to V for the period 1963-64 to 1974-75 alongwith rank position of the districts on the basis of secondary data. She has discovered that Bangalore City ranks first in terms of least wastage of 37.0 per cent among all the districts in the State in case of girls ; again, it ranks second with 40.0 per cent wastage in case of boys.

12. Sushila Bai : "Drop-outs in Lower Primary Schools —An Analysis," 'Kurukshetra' Vol. 27, No. 14, 16 April 1979.

13. A S Seetharamu : "Education in Slums" Ashish Publishing House, New Delhi, 1982.

CHAPTER II

SCHOOL DROP-OUTS IN RURAL AREAS

There are certain assumptions with which the study on school drop-outs was designed and conducted. These assumptions are fundamental to the organisation of field work and analysis of data. The assumptions are that the ecological context of an area referring to various aspects such as its geographical setting, nature of land, means of production, social structure, economic status, etc. determines its life styles. Life-styles, refer to various aspects such as Child-rearing, family and other social inter-actions, inter-personal relations, school participation, risk taking behaviour in relation to need achievement, participation in work force, child-labour, saving habits, development response, fertility behaviour, mobilisation, voluntary efforts, etc. Hence, schooling process is very much inter linked with the life-process in the area. The life-processes vary from region to region and the problems of life also are at variance. It is, therefore, assumed that problems of education are deeply inter-linked with problems of life and are region-specific. As regional variation may be there in problems of schooling the solution therein ought to vary. A study design to examine the problems should highlight the regional variations in nature and intensity of problems in schooling process in the context of the variations in life-processes and problems of life in the area. In other words, there is a need for an integral view of the problems of education. Attempts to look at it in isolation from its background, its context, the life process, though valuable would still be piece-meal, partial and effective. The study made here is an attempt to analyse the problems of schooling in general and school drop-out phenomenon in particular in the light of needed efforts at integrated rural development. As such the policy imperatives examined by this study would not only include needed efforts to maximise participation of children from all sections of society in the schooling process, but also those needed to improve the levels of living and levels of welfare of children in rural areas which in turn have a direct bearing on school participation.

In the foregoing framework of assumptions and general understandings, the study on school drop-outs was organised in ten talukas of Karnataka State. These talukas are distributed in five regions of the State and cover up regional variations. The rationale for selecting these talukas is already discussed in the introductory Chapter. Comparisons of two talukas, one with high drop-out rates and the other with low drop-out rates in each regions are made with respect to factors facilitating or inhibiting participation of children in schooling process. It would be interesting to learn as to how each of these sets of two talukas with similar ecological features registered low and high drop-out rates. They lend themselves for meaningful comparisons in terms of school-participation, learning situation, parental social and economic backgrounds, demographic composition at family-level, participation of children in paid labour, involvement of children in home-management, parental awareness of school facilities and educational incentives, etc.

The field work was done in 62 villages from these ten talukas of the State. All the primary schools in these villages were included in the study. A school schedule (see Appendix II) was convassed to obtain information about the number, sex, training, residence and experience of teachers, building, equipment, accommodation, community participation, play ground, incentive schemes, co-curricular activities, assets, etc.

The information collected from these schools would be of use in analysing school factors in drop-out phenomenon. They are analysed and interpreted in the Chapter on school factors.

A parents' schedule (see Appendix I) was canvassed in all these villages in the homes of drop-outs. A total of 1878 families of drop-outs could be covered. All the families covered were of those children who had dropped out of schools in the last four years (1975-1979) from standard I to standard VII. Analysis of information collected from families of drop-outs would be useful in analysing family variables in drop-out phenomenon.

In this Chapter, data collected from families of drop-outs have been analysed. The plan is as follows: Quite a number of family variations that may have a bearing on school participation are identified. Data on school drop-outs will be discussed in the light of each one of these variables. At the outset in the State an overall picture of drop-out phenomenon in the context of the family variables will be provided. Then regional variations that may be there with respect to the family variable will also be discussed. Sex-variations in school participation are covered wherever such variations are observed.

Stage of Schooling and Drop-out Phenomenon

Three stages can be identified in primary education in relation to retention of children. The first standard may be taken to be the first stage. Children are found to drop-out of school either within a few days of their admission to school or as time progresses and by the end of the year. The second stage may be taken to be the stage of completion of the lower-primary education or specifically the fourth standard. Drop-out phenomenon is pronounced at this stage especially in single teacher schools with standards I to IV. The third stage is at the V standard stage. Children who get enrolled to the V standard from villages having standards I to IV at villages having the higher primary standards may find the commuting difficult or face other adjustment problems and thus drop-out. It is interesting to note the stage at which the drop-out phenomenon is prominent. An analysis of stage-wise drop-out phenomenon in the State follows :

Table 1 : Showing standard-wise drop-out behaviour of boys and girls in Karnataka State (Figures in actual numbers)

Standards from which dropped out	*F*		
	Boys	*Girls*	*Total*
I	380	432	812
II	249	218	467
III	138	95	233
IV	125	91	216
V	46	30	76
VI	34	18	52
VII	11	11	22
Total	983	895	1878

In general it is observed that drop-out behaviour is highest at the first standard stage. Of those who drop-out from primary schools, over 43.0 per cent do so at the first standard stage itself. That is, they drop-out before completion of the year in which they are enrolled. Another 25 per cent drop-out at the second standard stage. As such two out of every three children who leave school do so in the first two years itself. Another 24 per cent drop-out at the third and fourth standard stages. As such nearly 92 per cent of children who leave school do so within the first four years of primary schooling. It may also be observed that there is a steady decline in drop-out rates, at the higher primary stages of education.

On a sex-wise analysis of the data, it was observed that while 93.3 per cent of girls dropped out before the completion of lower primary stage of education, 90.8 per cent of boys did so at the same stage. However, a higher percentage of girls drop-out at the first standard stage than that of the boys. If, 48.3 per cent of girls drop-out at first standard stage, only 38.6 per cent of boys drop-out like this. While the drop-out rates were similar at the second standard stage for boys (25.6%) and girls (24.3%), it was higher for boys (26.6%) than that of girls (20.7%) at the third and fourth standard stages. As such the first standard stage appears to be more crucial for girls than for boys.

Drop-out behaviour is not so high at the higher primary stage. This is true when school drop-out phenomenon at the higher primary stage is considered in relation to total drop-out data and not enrolment data Drop-out data are not considered in relation to enrolment data in this study as the focus of interest is not extent of wastage. They are considered with respect to standards and levels as the purpose is to focus on the pressure points in school education for children who leave the school.

As such it is observed that children either drop-out of school or they are pushed out of school mostly at the lower primary stage, and especially at the II and I standard stage. Hence, problem of retention of children in primary schools should be viewed by and large as a problem of retaining them mostly in the first two standards and specifically in the first standard stage itself.

Regional Variations

The standard-wise drop-out data were analysed separately for the five regions of the State (refer Table 3). On such an analysis it was observed that except the Hilly areas of Coorg and Tirthahalli, drop-out phenomenon appears to be in tune with that of the State. It is observed that coastal areas have the highest rate of drop-out at the first and second standard stages (77.1%). It is followed by the Industrial Belts (70.4%). Further, two out of every three children enrolled in schools in dry and wet areas have dropped out before the completion of the first two standards. The drop-out figures for the first two standards is lowest for the Hilly region and is 53.1 per cent.

If the lower primary stage of education is considered then almost all children who had dropped out of school have done so at this stage in the Dry, Wet and Coastal regions. The percentages of children who dropped out before completing Lower Primary Stages of Education are 96.9, 93.4 and 96.4 respectively. A slightly lower percentage in the Industrial Belts as compared to the three regions referred to earlier have dropped out before the Lower Primary Stage (89.1 per cent). Among the five regions, the drop-out rates at the Lower Primary Stage are lowest for the Hilly areas ; 77.6 per cent of children drop-out before the Lower Primary Stage in Hilly areas. Alternatively 22.4 per cent of children who are drop-outs in Primary Schools in Hilly areas are those who drop-out at Higher Primary Stages. They form 10.9 per cent in Industrial Belts. Drop-out rates at Higher Primary Stage in Dry, Wet and Coastal Areas are very low.

From the analysis of standard-wise drop-out rates in different regions it is observed that while the problem of drop-out is acute at the Lower Primary Stage and especially at the first and second standards in the Dry, Wet, Coastal and Industrial Belts, it is not so in Hilly areas. In Hilly areas the drop-out problems are to a significant extent observed in Higher Primary Stages.

Standard-wise Drop-out Variations in Low and High Drop-Out Areas of the State

The drop-out rates in various Low and High drop-out areas of the State were pooled up and analysed standard-wise (refer Table 4). It is observed that while 38.5 per cent of drop-outs in Low drop-out areas leave school at the first standard stage, 47.7 per cent do so in High Drop-out areas. Considering drop-out behaviour in the first and second standard stages of Education, 61.1 per cent and 74.7 per cent in Low and High Drop-out areas respectively leave school at these stages. In other words, for every two out of five children (8 out of 20) who leave school in the initial stages of Lower Primary Education in Low Drop-out areas, three out of four (12 out of 20) do so in High Drop-out Areas. Considering the Lower Primary Stage of Education, it is observed that if 89.8 per cent of drop-out had left school before the Lower Primary Stage, in Low Drop-out areas, the percentage is slightly higher (93.9 per cent) in High Drop-out areas. Alternatively among the drop-outs in Low Drop-out areas, 10.2 per cent had left school at the Higher Primary Stage while the figure for High Drop-out areas is 6.1 per cent.

As such there is not significant difference between Low and High drop-out areas, when the drop-out figures at the Lower and Higher Primary stages of Education are compared. However, within the Lower Primary stages of Education it is observed that while a higher percentage of drop-outs leave school in High Drop-out areas at the first and second standard level itself, in Low Drop-out areas the third and fourth standards appear to register a high drop-out rate than in High Drop-out areas.

Sex Variations in Standard-wise Drop-out Rates Among the Regions of the State

On an analysis of drop-out behaviour between Boys and Girls in different regions of the State, (refer Table 5) it is observed that a higher percentage of girls than that of Boys drop-out at the first standard stage in all regions of the State. The differential rate of drop-out at the first standard stage between Boys and Girls is highest in Wet areas of the State. For every three boys who leave school at the first standard stage in Wet areas, five girls drop-out of school. The differential rate of drop-outs between Boys and Girls at the first standard stage is lowest for Dry areas and is hardly 0.7 per cent. In fact, if the first two standards are considered together, there is no sex variation in drop-out behaviour in Dry areas. On the other hand sex variations have been observed in drop-out behaviour at the initial stages of school to a marked extent in wet, (a difference of 16.3 per cent is observed). Industrial Belt (13.8 per cent difference) and Hilly (11.6 per cent) areas.

Considering the Lower Primary stage of Education, it is observed that difference between the sexes in drop-out behaviour are not high in any region of the State except the Industrial Belts. Even there, the differential drop-out rate is hardly 7.6 per cent. Within the Lower Primary Stage of Education it is observed that higher percentage of boys drop-out at third and fourth standard stages in Wet and Hilly areas than girls. The sex differences in drop-out behaviour at third and fourth standard stages are not much in the other three areas of the State.

At the Higher Primary stage, drop-out behaviour of both boys and girls is neither high nor are there noticable sex differences in Dry, Wet and Coastal areas. On the other hand, a high percentage of Boys (22.0 per cent) as well as girls (24.0 per cent) drop-out at higher primary stage in Hilly areas. As against these regions in the Industrial Belts, the drop-out rates at Higher Primary stage are higher for Boys (16.3 per cent) than for Girls (8.7 per cent).

In essence sex variations are observed in drop-out behaviour only in Industrial Belts, Hilly and Wet areas of the State. Even these variations are observed only at the initial stages (first and second standards) of schooling. The sex differences are highest in wet areas and especially so at the first standard stage.

Standard-wise Sex Variations in Drop-out Behaviour between High and Low Drop-out Talukas of the State

On an analysis of sex variations, in drop-out behaviour between the Low and High Drop-out regions of the State (refer Table 6), it is observed that a higher drop-out rate among girls at the first standard stage perhaps contributes for a higher drop-out rate in High drop-out areas. If 36.6 per cent Boys and 40.6 per cent Girls drop-out at the first standard stage itself in Low drop-out areas, the corresponding figures for Boys and Girls in High drop-out areas are 40.5 per cent and 55.9 per cent. As such if the differential drop-out rate at the first standard stage in Low drop-out areas for the two sexes is 4.0 per cent, it is 15.4 per cent in High Drop-out areas. However, a higher percentage of boys than girls drop-out at the second standard stage in High drop-out areas. The differences in drop-out behaviour at the third and fourth standard stage between Boys and Girls appears to be significant only in the High Drop-out area and is of the order of 10.9 per cent. The differential drop-out rate is almost nil in High Drop-out areas when the Lower Primary stage of Education is considered. But, in the Low Drop-out area, at the Lower Primary Stage, a negligible 5 per cent difference between Boys and Girls is observed in drop-out behaviour.

As such not much sex variations are observed between Low and High Drop-out areas in drop-out behaviour either

S.C.E.R.T., West Bengal
Date 16.3.85
3468
371.2913
S.C.E.R.T., West B
Library

at the Lower Primary or at the Higher Primary stage. Whatever little sex differences are there between Low and High Drop-out areas appear on surface only at the first standard stage in the High Drop-out area. Perhaps a higher drop-out rate among girls in the initial stage of schooling has contributed to the higher drop-out rates in High drop-out areas.

Summary Observations of Variations in Standard-wise Drop-out Phenomenon with respect to Regions, Low and High Drop-out Areas a d Sex of Children

One significant feature of Drop-out phenomenon that emerges clearly even after considering regional, Low-High, and Sex variations in analysis of data is that the Drop-out phenomenon is essentially observed in the initial stages of schooling and specifically at the first standard stage. Irrespective of all variations, one out of two to three drop-outs leave school at the first standard stage itself. Further, two to three out of every four drop-outs leave school before completing the second standard stage. A minimum of three out of four children leave school before completing the Lower Primary stage of Education.

It is only in Hilly areas that the problem of drop-out is felt both at the Lower and Higher Primary stages. In other areas the problem is acute mainly at the Lower Primary Stages.

The Low-High variations in drop-out rates are caused not because of variations in either Lower Primary or Higher Primary Stages but because of variations only at the first standard stage of Lower Primary Stage. The High drop-out area register a higher drop-out rate at the first standard stage than the Low Drop-out areas.

A higher percentage of girls than boys drop-out in the initial stages in Industrial Belts, Hilly and Wet areas.

Highest differences between boys and girls in drop-out behaviour at the first standard stage are observed in Wet areas of the State. In other words, highest percentage of girls drop-out at the first standard stage in Wet areas as compared to boys.

Factors of Pressure

The pressure points for children to leave school appear to be the lower primary level of education and specifically the I standard stage. The problem of retention of children in school is basically a problem of retaining them at the initial stage.

The factors which operate in the school environment and bring up pressure on children to leave school may be classified into two types. One of them is internal to the school system and the other external to it. Those that are internal to the system include the quality of the learning process that goes in the school, the teacher-characteristics such as age, sex, experience, training and qualifications, the position of the school with regard to building, play ground, library and school equipment, the involvement of the school with the surrounding community, the rigour of enforement of incentive scheme for children etc., Drop-out behaviour with respect to all these school variables are analysed in the following Chapter. As such a discussion of the learning situation as a potential pressure source in relation to drop-out behaviour will be taken up here. The factors external to the school system are spread over the family in particular and the socio-economic environment in general. They may include such factors as the levels of education, occupation and income of parents, their caste-status implying their life-styles, the fertility behaviour and family organisation within the family-system, parental awareness and utilisation of school facilities and incentives etc. Further, they include the type of land-use and availability of labour-opportunities for children, the incidence of bonded labour, the practice of demanding and paying dowry in relation to the levels of education and types of employment of the bridegroom and level of education of the bride, the work-situation etc. A discussion of all these factors that are external to the school system and are related to the family and socio-economic environment around will follow in the context of drop-out phenomenon after an analysis of the learning situation.

Learning Situation

The Central Objective of all primary education is fixed in the teaching and learning of reading, writing and number work and through that the realisation of other objectives which may range from development of citizenship and character, environmental response-potential, basic skills of social life, emotional integration, attitude-development, etc. The other objectives may weigh well in importance in the minds of educational planners, administrators, teacher-educators and the other educational elite. The parents send their children to school and the children themselves come to school basically to learn reading, writing and number-work. A clientele-oriented management of the school system should be aware of parental and pupil expectation from the school. This will be by and large the basic minimum expectations of the community also. As children progress in learning to read, to write, to count and do other number work, they get themselves reinforced to stay on and to put in further effort. Such a learining situtation in the school will create a self-reinforcing process and act as a source of internal motivation for children to attend school. Even parents evaluate the performance of their children in terms of their expectations from school ; in other words, their perceived objectives. For this, the first standard stage of the primary school, the initial period of their stay in the school is crucial. Those who learn are perhaps better motivated to stay on than those who fail to learn. Thus the problem of retention of children in school significantly associated with the extent of learning that goes on in the school. The quality of the learning situation is also judged by the extent of learning and the coverage of children therein. Lack of learning acts as a source of pressure on children to leave school.

In the context of the foregoing discussion it will be interesting to know about the performance of children in learning at school before they left school. Before presenting the data collected in this study about the learning situation it is essential to underline the reservations with which data need to be considered. They are received data and are those reported by parents and conceded by respondents. They only suggest whether the children who attended school learnt to read or to write or to do number work either individually or in different permutations. They do not indicate the extent or quality of learning. Still they should be significant data as indicating the perceptions of parents about the performance of their children at school and the self-perceptions of drop-out children in the study.

Table 7 : Showing the Perceptions of Parents about the Performance of their Children before or at the time of leaving school

Type of response	*State – Figures*
Children did not learn	1130 (60.3%)
Children learnt at school	748 (39.7%)

It is observed that 60.3% of the drop-outs in the State had not learnt anything at school before they left it. Only in 39.7% of the cases had parents reported that their children had been able to read only, to write or to count. As such the high association between non-learning at school and drop-out behaviour is strikingly apparent.

An analysis of these non-learner drop-outs was made further so as to find out the standards from which they had dropped out, (refer Table 8) it was observed that 49.2% of drop-outs had not learnt anything at school before they left school and they had left it at the initial stages (I & II standards) of Education. When the data on non-learner school leavers are pooled up for Low and High Drop-out regions of the State, it was observed that if 43.8% of drop-outs in Low Drop-out areas had not learnt at school, the figure for High Drop-out areas is 54.4%. As such the performance of children in High Drop-out areas before they leave school is more dismal than that of the Low Drop-out areas.

Data about performance of drop-outs were analysed to examine regional variations (refer Table 8). The non-performance of drop-outs is highest in coastal (63.0% non-learners) and Dry (60.0%) areas of the State. While it is lowest (28 per cent) in Hilly areas. The non-performance of drop-outs who left school at the initial stages (I and II standards) for the various regions of the State in descending order of incidence are 63.0 per cent coastal, 60.0 per cent Dry, 49.0 per cent Industrial Belts, 46.0 per cent Wet, and 28.0 per cent Hilly areas.

The difference in the incidence of non-learning among drop-outs in Low and High drop-out area is highest in the Dry areas.

These data reinforce the earlier conclusion that the initial stage or the I and II standards of primary education are crucial in the retention of children. Serious efforts should be made to get the children learn the alphabets right from the first day they attend school and progressively to enable them to learn reading, writing and number work. If by the end of the first year children are enabled to read the prescribed textbook with ease, write all the alphabets, write the 'Kagunitha', do simple additions and substractions, etc., then they would be self-motivated to attend school. Parents satisfy themselves about the values of school attendance.

CHAPTER III

FAMILY BACKGROUND OF DROP-OUTS

The family background of drop-outs includes those factors which are external to the school system but influence the retention of children or their defection from school. Education, occupation and income of parents, the educational status of the family as a whole, family-size, health-status of parents etc. are all illustrations of such factors. A discussion of drop-out behaviour in the context of family background follows :

Education of Parents

It is observed that 65 2 per cent of fathers of drop-out children are illiterates (refer Table 9) In other words, two out of every three drop-out children are from families where the fathers are illiterates. Perhaps these children were the 'first generation participants' in the schooling process. This does not mean that the fathers of other drop-outs were educated. In between the response category for illiterates and primary educated, another category under the heading 'able to read and write' had been provided. 19.3 per cent fathers have reported that they had not completed any formal stage of education. However, they had learnt to read and write. As such the percentage of drop-outs who come from families where the fathers had some education, be it primary or secondary or higher than that is hardly 16.5. Among the educated fathers, a great majority (10.5% of the total) had acquired primary education only.

Low-High Variations

The data about education of fathers for Low and High Drop-out areas are pooled up to find out possible variations. Not much difference was observed between the education of the fathers in Low and High Drop-out areas. While 61.5 per cent of fathers of drop-out children in Low Drop-out areas are illiterates, the corresponding figure for High drop-out area is 68.8 per cent. In contrast, while 22.4 per cent of fathers of drop-out children in Low Drop-out areas have reported that they are 'able to read and write'. The corresponding figure for High Drop-out areas is 16.1 per cent.

Regional Variations

Illiteracy among fathers of drop-out children is highest in coastal areas (72.3 %) and lowest in Hilly areas (58.1%). If illiteracy among fathers of drop-outs in various regions are compared between Low Drop-out and High Drop-out areas, very high differences are observed in Hilly areas. If 42.0 per cent fathers of drop-outs are illiterate in Low Drop-out Hilly areas, there are 67.0 per cent illiterate fathers in High Drop-out areas. Lowest percentage of illiteracy among fathers of drop-out children in Hilly areas (58.1 per cent) and especially in Hilly Low Drop-out areas (42.0 per cent) may cause one wonder as to how there can be drop-outs from a high percentage of literate and educated families in Hilly areas. In this context, it may be recalled in passing that the problem of drop-out phenomenon is felt at higher primary stages also in hilly areas in contrast to other areas. As such though a higher percentage (majority) of fathers of drop-outs have reported that they are able to read and write or had education, still the drop-outs from such educated families may be at the higher primary stage.

Further, it is observed that highest percentage of drop-outs (34.0 per cent) in families where fathers are able to read and write are from Low Drop-out regions of Industrial Belts.

Education of Mothers

93.5 per cent of Mothers of Drop-out children in the State are illiterates (refer Table 10). There is not much variation between High and Low Drop-out regions of the State with respect to illiteracy among mothers. Further, except the Hilly region, illiteracy among mothers has crossed the 94.0 per cent mark. In Hilly regions, 84.9 per cent of mothers are illiterates. As a great majority of mothers in the State and also in the regions are illiterates, a deeper analysis of educational data of mothers has been left out.

Educational Attainment of the Family

The act of sending a child regularly to school is a 'habit'. This is a family habit. It is also intergral to a mental set, a readiness, an attitude built up over the years. It comes by practice, by past actions and by experience. It becomes integral to the life-styles of the family. It is observed that in certain high caste groups the poorest of the poor never fail to send their children to school and ensure a minimum levels of education. Educating children becomes a tradition of the family. On the other hand, in some lower caste rice agricultural families the parents may not insist on the regular attendance or schooling and education of children. As such to explain the problem of wastage with blanket reasons such as poverty, child labour, parental apathy, etc., may not be meaningful. The phenomenon has to be looked at with an overall perspective In this context it is interesting to observe as to what is the educational attainment of other members in the family of the drop-out. Data are discussed here and they include only the other children in the family in case of nuclear families and the children with other elders in joint families.

It may be observed from Table 11, that drop-out families where all elders to the drop-out having primary education or beyond that are negligible. They from only 2.7 per cent of the total sample. Again, one out of every six drop-outs (16.8 per cent) is the only child or the eldest child in the family. While there are no elders to the drop-outs in these families whose educational level is being examined, it is possible that parents of these drop-outs are also illiterates. Such families are of the nuclear type. Hence, habits of school participation in these families do not arise.

In cases of 29.1 per cent of the families of drop-outs, the elders to the drop-out have no education at all. As such school participation may not be a matter of habit in these families.

However, a surprising observation in the analysis of data about educational attainment of family members of drop-outs is that in 36.6 per cent cases, at least there are some elders to the drop-out who have reported that they had education either upto the primary level or beyond that. One may wonder as to how in a family where some elders have gone to school and had the benefit of primary or post-primary education can allow children to drop-out from school. As such data on educational attainment of members in the families of drop-out reveal a mixed trend. Drop-outs are there in families where all elders to the drop-out are with-out education as well as those where some elders are with education. However, it is clear that children in families where all elders to the drop-out had a full course of primary or post-primary education hardly leave school.

Parents' Occupation

The nature of occupation pursued by parents in terms of hours of work, time of duties, frequency of employment, nature of employment, income earned, place of work, etc. may all have an influence upon the prospects of school enrolment and attendance of children in the family. The nature of occupation pursued is symbolic of all these sub-variables and it is classified into nine categories. The distribution of the parents of drop-outs on these job categories is discussed here.

Occupation of Fathers

It is seen (refer Table 12) that drop-out children by and large belong to agricultural families, *viz.*, families where fathers own land and employ cultivators, cultivate their own land, work on others' farm as agricultural labourers, share croppers, etc. Over 77.3 per cent fathers of drop-out children belong to these categories. They are mostly those whose fathers cultivate their own land (31.7%) as well as those who own land and get them cultivated (27.1 per cent). Further 17.9 per cent work as agricultural labourers. As such three out of every five fathers of drop-out children have a land base. Those who are skilled or unskilled labourers, do retail business or servicing are in negligible proportions in the State. Their percentages to the total are 7.1, 6.8, 2.4 and 2.0 per cent respectively. Together they constitute 18.3 per cent.

Low-High Variations

When occupational data on Low Drop-out areas and High Drop-out areas are pooled up, it was observed that a higher percentage of drop-outs (25.3 per cent) come from non-agricultural families in High Drop-out areas than those

(11.3 per cent) in Low Drop-out areas. Alternatively, it was observed that for every four children who hail from agricultural families in High drop-out areas, there were five such in Low Drop-out areas.

Low-High Variations Among Regions

Drop-out data were analysed to find out if there are regional variations between Low and High Drop-out talukas with respect to nature of occupations of fathers of Drop-out children. Three types of trend are observed in the relation between nature of occupation of fathers and drop-out phenomenon. There is not much difference in the type of occupation pursued by fathers of drop-out children in Low and High regions of Wet and Hilly areas of the State. In dry and coastal areas, a high percentage of fathers of Drop-outs pursue non-agricultural occupations in High Drop-out re gions In contrast, in the Industrial Belts, a high percentage of fathers of drop-out children pursue non-agricultural occupations in Low drop-out areas.

Another significant feature observed in data about occupations of fathers of drop-out children is that quite a high percentage of fathers own land in low drop-out regions of Industrial Belts, Wet, Coastal and Hilly areas as compared to the same percentage of High drop-out regions of the same area. This trend is not observed in dry areas of the State. The inference from the fact that Low drop-out areas have higher percentage of land-owners is that because that they are better off and hence the region could become a Low Drop-out area.

Occupation of Mothers

On an analysis of data about occupation of mothers of drop-out children, it was observed that majority of mothers (53.5 per cent) are house-wives. A highest percentage of house-wives among mothers of drop-out children are in

Hilly areas (71.1 per cent). As such 46.5 per cent of mothers of Drop-outs in the State are engaged in work. A great majority of them (43.8 per cent) of the total are labourers who do agricultural labour or unskilled labour. The percentage of agricultural labourers is very much higher than those who are unskilled labourers. The proportion of mothers who do retail business, or engaged in skilled labour or service jobs constitute a very low and negligible percentage.

Low and High Variations

When data for Low and High Drop-out areas were pooled up, it was observed that the working mothers in Low Drop-out areas are made up of agricultural labourers and un-skilled labourers in equal proportions, while in High Drop-out areas a higher proportion are agricultural labourers.

I and holding and Drop-out Phenomenon

It is observed from Table 12 that in 58.8 per cent of drop-out families in the State, the fathers of Drop-out have reported that either they own lands and get them cultivated or cultivate their own lands. It will be worthwhile to see the extent of land holding among these families in relation to drop-out behaviour.

The discrepancy was observed between occupation data and land holding data (Table 15) of respondents. According to occupation data 58.8 per cent of fathers of drop-out children in the State own lands irrespective of whether they get them cultivated or cultivate themselves. When land holding data was analysed it is observed that 66.8 per cent own lands. However, little area it may be, the 8 per cent discrepancy could be explained on further analysis of data by the fact that there are quite a number of respondents in the State who are engaged in retail business, services, skilled and unskilled non-farm labour but still own some measure of land. They neither get them cultivated nor cultivate that themselves. They have given it to fellowvillagers for cultivation and get a share of the produce. As such the data on extent of land holding differs from that of occupation.

In general, for the State as a whole, majority of those who have reported that they own lands have marginal farms (less than 2.5 acres of dry land or 1.25 acres of Wet land). Of the rest, equal proportions (around 16.0 per cent) have small farms (between 2.5 to 5 acres of dry land, 1.25 to 2.5 acres of wet land) and large farms (more than 5 acres of dry land on 2.5 acres of wet land). 28.4 per cent of the fathers of drop-out children have reported that they are landless. The variations in low and high drop-out areas at the State level are negligible. Marginal farmers are highest in coastal areas while big farmers are highest in dry areas.

Distribution of Land

In terms of land distribution, there are imbalances in all regions of the State except the wet areas. In the wet areas the distribution of land among fathers of drop-outs and in terms of Marginal, Small and Large farms, there appears to be relatively a balanced distribution. Only in low Drop-out wet areas, there is a slight tendency towards concentration of respondents at Marginal farms. The distribution of land in the other four regions of the State among the landed respondents is uneven. If it is uneven in favour of Marginal farms in Coastal, Industrial Belts and Hilly areas, it is uneven in favour of large farms in dry regions. This unevenness or tendency towards the same is observed in the areas referred to irrespective of Low-High variations.

Drop-out Behaviour when both Parents are Employed

It is observed from Table 16 that in 38.4 per cent of the families of drop-out children, both the father and mother are employed. The parents in such families are mostly (36.2 per cent) are field/farm workers. The non-farm worker parents are negligible. Variations in drop-out behaviour of boys and girls from such families are very little. Only in Industrial Belts, a higher percentage of girls (24.6 per cent) than boys (15.3 per cent) drop-out from families where both parents are employed. Highest percentage of drop-outs (49.7 per cent) in whose families both parents are from dry areas.

Parents' Income

The income earned by a family is an important index of its economic status. The economic status in turn influences the parental interest in scrooling of children. This has been borne out by several studies. Most of the studies have revealed that poverty is a very significant reason for wastage in school education. It will be interesting to see how far the data collected in this study confirm or confound the earlier findings.

The income data presented here are computed rather than collected. The farmers were not able to say as to what exactly will be their income in a year or what was it during the previous year. But they could say the average yield over a period of time and during the last year on their farm. They could give this data in terms of number of bags of their produce. As such the number of bags of paddy, wheat, ragi, maize, *jowar* etc. the number of bags of pulses and oilseeds, the number of tonnes in case of sugarcane, the number in case of coconuts or bags in case of areca etc. grown by the farmers depending upon the geographical location of the area of study were collected. The quantities of produce were converted into their rupee value taking into account both the procurement price and the market value of the produce. The rates were taken as those prevailing during the time of field work, that is September 1980 to February 1981. The income data thus obtained is arranged in a frequency distribution and presented here. By and large the income data may be taken to be reliable though it is a sensitive one and the villagers may not come out with full facts. This is because the data were cross-checked during the interview itself on the basis of knowledge of the average yield per acre in the area and the inputs therein.

Data from non-farm workers and agricultural labourers were collected on the basis of daily wage rates and availability of work. However, in spite of all these precautions, it is essential to bear in mind that the income data is only a received data and is subject to a margin of error, however, small it may be.

It is observed from Table 17 that 78.5 per cent of fathers of drop-out children in the State get an annual income which is below Rs. 3000/-. In other words nearly four out of five children are from such families. If Rs. 10,000 and higher than that annual income is considered, then it is observed that hardly 0.3 per cent drop-outs are from such families. If income data for low and high drop-out areas in the State are pooled up, it is observed that a slightly lower percentage of fathers of drop-out children (74.9 per cent) earn below Rs. 3000/- per annum in Low Drop-out areas than those in High Drop-out area (84.6 per cent). As such the percentage of those who get less than Rs. 3000/- is lower in Low Drop-out areas than that in High Drop-out areas among drop-out families. If variations between the different income ranges in the State are examined with respect to the proportion falling in different income ranges below Rs 3000/- per annum, not much differences are observed

Low-High and Regional Variations

It is observed that the percentage of fathers getting less than Rs. 3000/- per annum is highest in wet areas (87.7 per cent). It is closely followed by the dry areas (83.2 per cent). The percentage goes down quite significantly among Coastal and Hilly areas and Industrial Belts.

The percentages are also equally distributed in these three areas. They are 71.9, 71.9 and 73.6 respectively. If low-high variations are considered within the regions (refer Table 18) then it is observed that there are no variations in income data of below Rs. 3000/- in dry regions. The observation is true only for data pooled up from all the income slabs up to Rs. 3000/- per annum. Variations have been observed in other regions. The percentage of those fathers who get less than Rs. 3000/- per annum is lower in Low Drop-out areas than those in High Drop-out areas in Industrial Belts, and Wet and Coastal areas. It is the other way round in Hilly areas. In passing it may be recalled that drop-out phenomenon in a Hilly Low Drop-out area is observed significantly at higher primary stage which is not so in the other areas of the State.

Income Distribution and Drop-out Phenomenon

An attempt was made to examine the relation between distribution of Income and drop-out phenomenon. It was hypothesized that drop-out phenomenon may be positively related with inequality of Income between regional and Low-High Drop-out areas in a region. To begin with it was felt that skewness in distribution may be computed using data of Mean Income, Median Income and Standard Deviations of Income in these regions and areas. It was planned to compute 'Gini' co-efficients to measure inequality, only if skewness results were promising. The skewness values for the various regions and Low-High Drop-out areas are presented in Table 18. This Table also presents Mean Income and Standard Deviations in Income for all the regions and Low High Drop-out areas of the State. The Mean Income refers to the annual income per household for drop-out families. As 80 per cent of drop-out families live far below the poverty line and are chronically poor, the Mean annual incomes are very low. A significant difference between the Means was observed only in case of Industrial Belts when Mean Incomes between Low and High Drop-out areas were considered. The difference between Mean and Median Income appears to be significant only in wet areas and skewness is also highest in wet regions. Skewness has been quite low in all the other areas and regions of the State.

The association between Mean Income of drop-out families in the talukas covered in the study and drop-out rates at the initial stages (I & II standards) was computed using the rank difference method. The obtained value of 'rho' (e) was 0.29 which is not significant. As such analysis of Income distribution data through computation of 'skewness' and 'rho' did not yield encouraging results. Hence, further analysis of income distribution data with respect to drop-out phenomenon is given up. Perhaps a similar analysis with respect to general population in terms of those who send their children to school regularly and those who have withdrawn their children from school may show up unequal distribution of income as a factor in drop-out phenomenon. Such an analysis may be attempted in another research study.

Rural Poverty and Drop-out Phenomenon

Several studies have shown the negative association of parental poverty with pupil participation in school. Poverty is widely recognised as one of the strong reasons for drop-out phenomenon. The extent of drop-out behaviour in relation to the magnitude of the poverty position of parents is hardly discussed in these studies. Such an analysis is a highlight of this study.

As per an estimate of the Planning Commission on the basis of nutritional requirements Rs. 61.8 is the cut-off point of poverty line for rural areas. (Draft Five-Year Plan 1978-83, Planning Commission, Government of India, p. 50). This cut-off point means that Rs. 61.8 per capita is the minimum income per month to satisfy the nutritional requirement. The reference period for this estimate is the price index for 1976-77.

Taking 70-71 = 100 as the base year, the All India wholesale price index for 1976-77 was 176.6. This is for all commodities taken together. (Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, Bombay, Vol. 34, No. 12, December 1980).

All India whole-sale price Index for all commodities during September to December 1980 which was the period of data collection is in the range 258.2 to 264.5 with an average of 260.7. As such the increase from 76-77 to the end of 1980 is the difference between 260.7 and 176.6 which is 84.1. If the increase is 84.1 for 176.6 then the percentage increase is over 47.0 per cent. If Rs. 62.1 was required for crossing poverty line which is defined as that below with a person will not be able to meet the 2400 calorie requirement per day in rural areas, then the additional amount required for some calorie in-take at 1980 prices will have to go up by 47.0 per cent. This will come around Rs. 90/- per month. As such Rs. 90/- is the cut-off point of poverty line meaning a person with a monthly income which is less than Rs. 90/- per month will have to be treated as below poverty line.

If Rs. 90/- is the cut-off point of poverty line per capita then what should be the cut-off point for a rural family ? The data on family collected in this study has revealed that nearly eighty per cent of families of drop-outs in the State are nuclear in structure. In other words, a great majority of drop-out families in rural areas are nuclear. The average family-size in these nuclear families work out to be more than 5.10, when a family was defined as husband, wife and their children. Five members can be safely assumed as family-size for computation of the cut-off line of poverty with respect of family income. In that case as income of Rs. 450/- per month (or Rs. 5400/- per annum) in a rural family still keeps it under poverty-line. Allowing a margin of 7.5 error in estimates, an income of Rs. 5000/- and below that for a family in a rural area can be taken to be under poverty line.

It is observed from family data of nuclear families that in nearly fifty per cent of families both the husband and wife work in the State. The amount of money earned by a great majority of the wives in such families is below Rs. 500/- per annum. This is because most of the women workers are agricultural labourers who get seasonal employment and are low-paid.

In the light of foregoing analysis, it is observed that four out of five drop-out children in rural areas are from homes which are definitely below the poverty line. The income, taken as that of husband or both husband and wife also, of the family in these drop-out homes does not cross Rs. 3500/- per annum while Rs. 5000/- is the cut-off point of poverty-line. It is not that all these drop-outs whose family income is far below the poverty line are getting Rs. 3500/- or around that amount. As may be seen from Table 7, significant percentages of drop-out families are in still lower income ranges such as those in 1001-2000, 501-1000 and lower than that. In fact, there is a concentration of drop-outs in the income range 1001 to 2000+500 (+500 when both parents are employed). They are 29.6% of the total. The drop-outs in the lower income ranges are not just from 'poor' but 'Chronically poor' families. They are the poor among the poor.

Social Back-grounds of Drop-outs

Only the religion and caste information of drop-outs are discussed under social background. Data on caste background is analysed only for drop-out children from Hindu families. The caste-classification used here is an adaptation from the Bangalore City Survey Project of the ISEC. Data on social background are presented in Table 20.

Religion

It is observed with respect to religious composition of drop-out families that a great majority of the drop-outs are from the Hindu families (refer Table 20). They form 88.68 per cent of the total sample of drop-outs under study. They are followed by the Muslims who form 9.0 per cent of the total drop-out families. The percentages of Christians and Jains in the total sample are 0.75 and 0.22 respectively and as such negligible. A comparison of the distribution of rural population in the State with respect to religious composition of the sample for the study is give here :

Religion	*Hindus*	*Muslims*	*Christians*	*Jain*	*Others* .
In the sample	88.68%	9.0%	0.75%	0.22%	—
In the rural population of the State (1971 Census)	90.66%	7.30%	1.33%	0.65%	0.06%

It is observed that there is a slightly lower percentage of Hindus in the sample than are they distributed in the total population of the State.

Muslims are highly concentrated among drop-out families in high area of Dry region (Humnabad) and low area of Industrial Belt (Bangarpet). This is understandable because there is significant proportion of Muslims in these two areas of the State.

Maximum percentage of Hindus among drop-out families are in High Drop-out area of Industrial Belts. All the families covered in the study are Hindus. Similarly the lowest percentage of Hindus in the State (65.33 per cent) are in Low Drop-out areas of Industrial Belt. It is significant to note that among the Hindus, in High Drop-out area a high percentage (45.65 per cent) of drop-outs, the highest in the State, belong to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Looking at drop-out data of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled

Tribes in different sets of Low-High Drop-out areas it is observed that with the exception of Dry, Hilly and Coastal areas a higher percentage of Scheduled Caste drop-outs are from High Drop-out areas than from Low Drop-out areas.

Regional Variations for Caste Composition

The Agricultural Castes form a significant group among drop-out families in different regions of the State. In wet and coastal areas, every alternate drop-out is from an agricultural caste family whereas in Dry, Hilly areas and Industrial Belts one out of three drop-outs has an agricultural caste background.

The Scheduled Castes are a significant group in all regions except in Wet and Coastal Areas. In coastal areas they form hardly 7.3 per cent of the total sample of drop-outs. In Wet areas, they form 16.9 per cent of the total. The low percentage representation of Scheduled Caste in Coastal areas and to a certain extent in Wet areas is understandable in the context of their proportion in the total population of the Coastal and Wet talukas covered in the study. The proportions are very low. For instance in Honnavar (Coastal Low Drop-out taluka) Scheduled Castes form 3.23 per cent of the total population in the taluka. While in Bhatkal (Coastal high taluka) they form 1.13 per cent of the total population in the taluka. Similarly in Pandavapura, (Wet low drop-out taluka) and Gokak (wet high taluka) they form 9.8 and 13.04 percentage of the total population of the talukas. In other regions, one out of every three drop-outs is from a Scheduled Caste family. The proportion of Artisan and Servicing caste is high only in Dry, Wet and Coastal areas of the State.

The Scheduled Caste population in the total sample of drop-out families in the study is 45.7 per cent in High Drop-out areas of Industrial Belt. It is also the highest among the ten talukas in the State under study. The highest proportion of Agricultural Caste in the State is in Low Drop-out area of the Wet region and it is 72.2% of the total. Similarly highest proportion of servicing and artisan castes are there in High Drop-out area of Wet region. They form 57.6 per cent of the total. The warrior and soldier castes are a significant group only in both Low and High Drop-out areas of Hilly regions. The Brahmins are not a significant group anywhere in the State. Similarly the trading castes are not a significant group anywhere in the State except in low areas of Industrial Belts.

CHAPTER IV

THE DROP-OUT'S WORLD

How does the drop-out spend his time ? What does he do ? There is a saying that the child on the farm or the field is more productive and valuable than a child at school. This possibility is often quoted as one of the strong reasons for wastage in education. In other words parental poverty and the consequent drive of the parents to employ their own children in farm or non-farm work of the house to save on labour or alternatively to send the children for paid labour is cited as a factor of wastage. In the present study is it observed that parents of the drop-outs are not only poor but most of them are far below the poverty line. As such it would be interesting to find out whether child labour, may be paid or domestic, is associated with phenomenon. It is true that all those children who drop-out of school assist their parents in agriculture and other family occupations or go for paid labour ? If not, what percentage of drop-out children are engaged in labour ? What do the others do ?

Assuming that drop-out children are engaged in labour and the degree of their participation in labour being immaterial, are employed either at home or outside, then how can the school system be geared to the needs of these children ? For this data about the daily duration of their labour, timing of the same, frequency of labour etc. would provide directives. Further, data about the kind of work done by them, the sex variations in child labour, the way the child's earnings are spent etc ; are also useful in redesigning the school system. In other words, such data provide the framework for a meaningful programme of non-formal education. It is in this context of the life of the child after he is branded as a 'drop-out' that data are analysed in the following section.

The world of work of the drop-out may be classified into domestic or unpaid work and paid work. Domestic work, again, may be sub-divided as work relating to home-management which is usually done inside the house itself and work relating to home-management which is usually done outside the home. Similarly, paid work can be further split up into paid agricultural labour and paid non-agricultural labour. The domestic work, whether inside or outside the home is treated in an integral way. Paid work is also treated together.

Duties of the Drop-out Inside the Home

The drop-outs are useful to the home in various way. They are engaged daily in diverse home-management activities. The various types of services rendered by drop-outs are : looking after younger children, bringing water to the home from the well or village tank, assisting the mother in cooking, cleaning the house, cleaning house-hold utensils, washing clothes either at home or in the village tank, etc. In fact these works are definable as they are regular in nature. There are many other various types of work which cannot be classified in a specific way but are referred to as a work assistance at home.

Children who leave school are serviceable to their homes in various ways. Several studies have revealed that one such major and essential service rendered by drop-out children, is the care of younger children at home. In contrast to the earlier studies the present State-wide study has revealed that supplying water or carrying water from the nearest water source to the house is a major activity of drop-out children in terms of frequency of reporting (refer Table 21). Care of younger ones, though an important activity is next in order of frequency of reporting to carrying water. Majority of drop-outs, 54.2 per cent, are required to carry water. This is followed by 'care of younger ones at home' which is done by 44.1 per cent of the drop-outs. In 43.8 per cent of the cases of drop-outs the parents have reported that their drop-out children assist them in their daily work, either on the farm or inside the home. In order of frequency of reporting, other important services rendered by drop-out children are 'washing clothes' (35.5 per cent) 'cleaning vessels' (31.6 per cent), cooking and cleaning the house (27.8 per cent each).

A higher percentage of girl drop-outs than boy drop-outs are serviceable at home in each one of these activities. And especially so in such activities as cooking, cleaning the vessels, washing clothes and cleaning the house.

A higher percentage of drop-outs in general are serviceable at home in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas. This is especially true in relation to such activities as carrying water, looking after younger ones, work assistance to parents, washing clothes and cooking. Again in these activities girls render more service than boys.

Regional Variations

An average of percentages of children engaged in all home-management activities was taken for the State as a whole and for different regions of the State. It was observed that only in hilly areas the drop-out children are not very much serviceable to their parents in home management activities. Hardly 21.7 per cent drop-out children on an average assist their parents in hilly areas. It is highest in Industrial Belts (49.0 per cent) and higher than the State average (37.8 per cent) in dry areas (43.5 per cent) apart from Industrial Belts.

It was observed that 37.8 per cent of drop-outs in the State assist their parents in home management. This is true when participation in all activities are considered together irrespective of the nature of work and the time needed for the same. Going further it was observed that among those who render service at home, the girls far out number the boys. For every serviceable boy there are two serviceable girls. It is only in hilly areas that there is not any difference in the serviceability of drop-out boys and girls at home. The differential assistance is highest in favour of girls in Industrial Belts. 70.1 per cent of girls assist in Industrial Belt as against 18.4 per cent of boys. Another region where apparently significant differences are observed between serviceability of boys and girls is the coastal areas.

In terms of low-high region-wise and sex-wise analysis of the nature of duties of the drop-outs at home, it was observed that carrying water to the home from the nearest source stands out as the most frequently reported activity in rural areas in the State. It is only in hilly and coastal areas that this trend is not observed. It appears that carrying water to home is not an important activity in Hilly areas and to some extent in Coastal areas. This may be because of the easy accessibility of water to the village. Further, it may be observed in passing that drop-out behaviour is lowest in hilly areas and percentage of literacy is quite high and above State average in these areas. In Low Drop-out hilly areas, where participation of drop-outs in home management is lowest in the State, the pressure point for drop-out children is significantly at the Higher Primary stage in contrast to other areas where the drop-out phenomenon is essentially at

Lower Primary stage and especially first and second standard stage phenomenon.

Duties of the Drop-out Outside the Home

Looking after cattle, pigs and poultry, collecting cowdung, firewood and other articles of household use, shopping, assisting father or mother in their out-of-home work etc., are the type of jobs in which drop-out children are engaged. Of all of them, the care of cattle/pigs/poultry appears to be the most significant activity in terms of its frequency of reporting by parents of drop-out children (refer Table 22) 49.7 per cent in low drop-out areas. 43.0 per cent in High Drop-out areas and 45.9 per cent drop-out children in the State as a whole attend to this domestic work. The percentages referred to here are higher than those reported for collecting firewood, collecting cowdung, shopping and work assistance to father or mother. It is only in High Drop-out areas of the State pooled together, net percentage of children collecting firewood is higher than those who care for cattle/pigs/poultry. Next in order of importance in other words, frequency of reporting is the activity—"collect firewood". 38.9 per cent of drop-out children in the State do this job. Work assistance to parents, collecting cowdung and shopping follow in order of frequency. The participation of drop-out children in out-of-home domestic work is lowest in hilly areas. It is highest in dry areas of the State and that too for boys. It is also high for boys in Industrial Belts only with respect to care of cattle.

Regional Variations

An average of percentages of children engaged in all out-of-home activities was taken for the State as a whole and for different regions of the State. On such an analysis it was observed that one out of every three drop-outs is serviceable to the home in domestic duties outside the home. Sex variations are not observed in such serviceability. Drop-out children are serviceable in highest proportions in dry areas. 46 4 per cent of boys and 47.5 per cent of girls assist their home in out of the home domestic duties in dry areas. Serviceability is lowest in hilly areas. It is hardly 18.6 per cent. Again while 9.7 per cent of boys are serviceable 27.6 per cent of girls are serviceable. Sex variations in serviceability are not observed in other regions.

Time of Duties of Drop-outs

Work for the drop-outs as a general rule is spread out during the whole day. A large majority of drop-outs in the State work during morning, evening and afternoon (refer Table 23). 74.5 per cent, 64.9 per cent and 64.5 per cent of parents of drop-out children have reported that the drop-outs during morning, afternoon and evening respectively. A higher percentage of girls than boys work during all the three periods of the day. This is true even when data for low drop-out areas and high drop-out areas pooled up and compared. The girls are busier relatively during morning times than th other two periods.

Regional Variations

On an analysis of region-wise data, it is observed that a higher percentage of girls than boys are engaged in domestic work either inside the home or outside the home during all periods of the day. (morning, afternoon and evening) in all regions of the State and in the State as a whole except in dry and wet areas where only during evening times, a slightly higher percentage of boys than girls are engaged in domestic work. Though two out of three drop-out children are engaged in domestic work during morning/afternoon/evening in the State, still it is observed that only the dry, wet, coastal regions and Industrial Belts show up similar trends as that of the State. The hilly regions do not fall in line with the trends in the State and significant percentage of drop-outs, especially boys do not work during morning/afternoon/evening.

112184

Low-High Variations

Data were analysed to compare the percentage of drop-out children engaged in domestic duties outside the home during morning, afternoon and evening times in the Low/High areas of the State, on such an analysis it was found that fifteen comparisons were possible and out of these fifteen comparisons, in ten comparisons it was discovered that a higher percentage of drop-outs are engaged in out of home domestic duties in High Drop-out area than in Low Drop-out area. While equal percentages of drop-outs in Low and High Drop-out areas are engaged in domestic work during morning times, children in Low Drop-out areas are relatively less busy than those in High Drop-out areas during afternoon and evening times.

Duration of Work

Majority of drop-outs in the State work between five to eight hours in a day. This is true with respect to girls and not so with respect to boys. It is only when data for boys and girls are clubbed together that it is observed that majority of drop-outs work for five to eight hours. Otherwise it is observed that majority of girls and a minimum of 20 per cent more than boys work for five to eight hours a day in the State irrespective of whether it is a Low or a High Drop-out area. In other words for every two out of five boys who work for five to eight hours a day there are three such girls. The percentages of those who work for more than eight hours a day or those who work for one or two hours only in a day are quite low and negligible among boys as well as girls in both Low and High Drop-out areas. As such it is observed that by and large drop-out girls assist their parents in domestic works relating to home management inside the home in a greater measure and for longer hours than boys.

Regional Variations

The highest percentage of drop-outs work between five to six hours in all regions of the State except the dry areas (refer Table 24). In the dry areas, they work for seven to eight hours a day. However, highest percentage of drop-outs work between five to eight hours only in Industrial Belts They form 62.9 per cent of the total. They are followed by drop-outs in dry areas who form 56.8 per cent. The figures of drop outs who work for five to eight hours in wet, coastal and hilly areas are 49.9%, 44.4% and 31.4 per cents respectively. A higher percentage of girls than boys work for either five to six hours or seven to eight hours in all regions of the State, except in Industrial Belts where a higher percentage of boys than girls work for five to six hours.

When comparisons for boys and girls working for either five to six hours or seven to eight hours were made in Low as well as High Drop-out areas, it was observed that out of twenty such comparisons, in four cases only a higher percentage of boys over girls put in these working hours. The cases are two Low Drop-out areas—one each in five to six hours and seven to eight hours ranges in dry region and two cases, each in Low and High Drop-out areas of Industrial Belts in the range five to six hours.

Among those who work for more than eight hours, significant percentages are observed only in Industrial Belts. 31.2 per cent drop-outs, 37.9 per cent girls and 19.6 per cent boys both in High Drop-out Industrial Belts work for more than eight hours a day. In all other regions, whether in High or Low Drop-out areas the percentages are either nil or negligible.

Drop-outs in Paid Work

It could be observed from Table 25 that one out of every five drop-out children in the State is engaged in paid work. The type of work done may be either agricultural or farm labour or non-agricultural work. The non-agricultural paid work includes tending cattle, assistance in shops and hotels, servicing as maids, selling flowers and vegetables, construction or cooly work, rolling beedies, incense sticks, etc.

Most of the drop-outs in paid work do agricultural labour (refer Table 25). They form 14.5 per cent of the total drop-out sample or three out of every four children in paid work. A higher percentage of boys than girls are engaged in agricultural labour. This is true of all regions in the State without considering low-high variations. However, if low-high variations are considered, it is observed that in seven out of ten comparisons of participation of boys and girls in paid agricultural labour, in the five Low Drop-out and the five High Drop-out talukas of the State, a higher percentage of boys than girls are engaged in paid agricultural work. But, in Low Drop-out dry areas the percentages of participation of boys and girls is almost the same. Further, in Low Drop-out wet areas and High Drop-out coastal areas, a higher percentage of girls than boys are engaged in agricultural labour. However, the participation of drop-outs in High Drop-out Coastal areas is itself very low.

The highest percentage of participation of drop-outs in paid agricultural labour is in the hilly areas of the State. Two out of five drop-outs (39.7 per cent) are engaged in agricultural labour in hilly areas. The participation is slightly higher in Low Drop-out over High Drop-out areas. In hilly areas every alternate boy drop-out is engaged in paid agricultural labour irrespective of whether it is a Low or a High Drop-out area.

Frequency of Employment in Paid Agricultural Work

It is essential to bear in mind that only 14.5 per cent of drop-outs are engaged in paid agricultural work. The following is an analysis of data about these drop-outs only. The proportion of drop-outs who get paid agricultural work on a regular basis in the State is quite insignificant and negligible (Table not included in the report). Children who have reported that they get paid agricultural work mostly refer to 'occasional' employment. It is highest for the State. 53.1 per cent of children in paid agricultural labour get occasional work only. This is true for High Drop-out as well as Low Drop-out areas of the State. However, one out of every three children in the State frequently get paid agricultural work.

A higher percentage of girls than boys in low drop-out areas of the State get frequent or even regular employment. In contrast, a higher percentage of boys than girls in high drop-out areas of the State get frequent or even regular employment. Employment on a regular basis is not available in low-dry, high coastal and high Industrial Belts. In other areas it is negligible.

Drop-outs in Paid Non-Agricultural Work

It may be recalled that hardly 5.6 per cent of drop-outs in the study are engaged in paid non-agricultural work. A higher percentage of boys than girls are engaged in such labour in the Low as well as the High Drop-out areas of the State as a whole. A higher percentage of drop-outs in non-agricultural work are in High Drop-out areas rather than in Low Drop-out areas (refer Table 25). This is true even of boys and girls. In terms of numbers, out of 106 drop-outs in paid non-agricultural work in the study (out of 1878 which is a sample) 86 working drop-outs are boys. Further, out of every four boy drop-outs in paid non-agricultural work, two are in coastal areas and one is in dry areas. In other words, 50.0 per cent of boys in paid non-agricultural work are in coastal areas and mostly in the high drop-out areas of coastal region. They are engaged either in the Hotel Industry or in the Beedi Manufacturing Industry. Similarly 50.0 per cent of girls in paid non-agricultural work are in high drop-out areas of coastal region. The others are distributed throughout the other regions.

Most of the drop-outs engaged in paid non-agricultural work have to work all through the day (Table not included). A few drop-outs (one-fourth of the working drop-outs) have work only during morning times. Though children have to work all through the day, the work is treated mostly as part-time. This is especially true of children in coastal areas. The work of two out of every four children in the State is treated as part-time, one out of the four is treated as full-time and the rest as occasional.

Majority of those drop-outs engaged in paid non-agricultural work, the work is spread out for five to eight hours in a day (Table not included in the report). A few work beyond eight hours also.

Income of the Drop-out

It may be recalled that 14.5 per cent of the drop-outs in the sample are engaged in paid agricultural work. The annual income of two-thirds of these drop-outs does not go beyond Rs. 300/-. This does not work out even to the extent of Rs. 25/- per month on an average. The percentage of drop-outs' earning less than Rs. 300/- per annum in agricultural work is higher in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas (refer Table 26). Alternatively in the Low Drop-out areas, a slightly higher percentage of drop-outs in agricultural work are able to get more than Rs. 300/- per annum that those in High Drop-out areas. It is not that all those drop-outs who get less than Rs. 300/- per annum get that amount. They are distributed almost equally in the ranges Rs. 201-300, and Rs, 101-200, and below Rs. 100/- also. The mean annual income of a drop-out in paid agricultural work in the State is Rs. 245/-. It is hardly over Rs. 200 per month. The Median Income is also around this figure (Rs. 285.9) which indicates that the picture of the mean income is a representative one. Further, there is not much variation in mean and median incomes in Low and High Drop-out areas from that of the State.

Coming to paid non-agricultural work it may be recalled that hardly 5.6 per cent of drop-outs are engaged in such work. Payment in non-agricultural work appears to be slightly better than that in agricultural work as the percentage of children who get less than Rs. 25/- per month is 41.5 only. But even here two out of three working drop-outs get less than Rs. 50/- per month and three out of four get less than Rs. 75/- per month. In other words, those who get more than Rs. 75/- per month are very few. Further, only ten per cent of drop-outs in the State in paid non-agricultural work (11 out of 106) get over Rs. 150/- per month. Payment for non-agricultural work is slightly better in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas (refer Table 27).

Regional Variations in Drop-outs' Income

Majority of drop-outs in Industrial Belt and Coastal areas and a great majority in Dry and Wet areas get an annual income of less than Rs. 300/- in paid agricultural work (refer Table 26). It is only in Hilly areas that majority of the drop-outs get more than Rs. 300/- per annum. This is a significant fact as out of the total drop-outs engaged in paid agricultural work in the State, 34.8 per cent are in Hilly areas only. Percentages of drop-outs getting less than Rs. 300/- per annum in Dry, wet, Industrial Belts, Coastal and Hilly areas are 90.0, 83.0, 63.0, 60.0 and 44.0 respectively. Further, it is observed from Table 28 that the Mean Income of drop-outs in agricultural work is highest in the State in Hilly areas (Rs. 359/- per annum). Though, 25.6 per cent of drop-outs in paid agricultural work are from Dry areas, it registers the lowest Mean Income in the State (148.66/- per annum). The Median Income is higher than the Mean Income in all regions of the State and in the State as a whole except in Industrial Belts. In Industrial Belts, the Mean Income is higher than the Median Income. This suggests that the distribution of income is negatively skewed everywhere except in Industrial Belts. In the Hilly areas, paid agricultural work of drop-out children appear to be promising in terms of Mean Income and Median Income. This explains a highest percentage of drop-outs in paid agricultural work being present in Hilly areas. A majority get an annual income of more than Rs. 300/- also. Moreover drop-out phenomenon is perceptible at the higher primary stage in Hilly areas only in the State. Perhaps, children who are elderly are absorbed in paid agricultural work in Hilly areas and the younger children might not be encouraged to work. Significant differences between Low and High Drop-out areas are observed in Mean Income only in Dry areas.

The Mean monthly income of drop-outs engaged in paid non-agricultural work is over Rs. 53/-. Drop-outs in High Drop-out areas of the State get a slightly higher Mean Income than these in Low Drop-out areas. The Mean Income of drop-outs in the coastal areas where a significant chunk of drop-outs in paid non-agricultural work are represented is Rs. 57/-. The Mean Income of other regions are not considered for serious analysis as the number of entries itself is quite low.

Sex Variations

On an analysis of data to examine sex variations in income of drop-outs it was observed that whether agricultural or non-agricultural paid work, the girls got a lower income than boys. This was true in comparisons of income of boys and girls in Low and High Drop-out areas of the State as a whole. However, majority of drop-outs. whether boys or girls get less than Rs. 300/- per annum, in agricultural work and less than Rs. 50/- per month in non-agricultural work.

Where does the Drop-outs' Earnings Go

It is observed that the earnings of drop-outs by and large are spent on maintenance of the family through out the State. (Table not included in the report). This is true with respect to earnings of drop-outs in both non-agricultural and agricultural work. Maintenance of family refers only to expenses on such items as food and beverages. Not even a part of it is either saved or spent on the drop-out exclusively. It is also not used for purchasing cattles/ household articles. A few parents did not like to answer this question at all. In seven out of ten talukas of the State under study, the drop-outs' earnings from agricultural income is spent on family maintenance only. Four out of these seven are Low Drop-out talukas, With respect to non-agricultural income, it was observed that leaving out one High Drop-out and one Low Drop-out taluka in the State, in the rest of the eight talukas, the drop-outs' income is spent only on family maintenance.

Is it very necessary for parents to withdraw their children from school and send them for paid work ? Can they not manage their food and other needs from their own earnings ? In other words, is the drop-outs' earning essential to the parents for maintenance of the family or is it only an additional income ? In answer to these questions great majority of the parents of drop-out children in the State have reported that child's earning is essential to the maintenance of the family (Table not presented in the report). This is true with respect to children in agricultural as well as non-agricultural paid work. While 82.3 per cent parents of drop-out children in paid agricultural work have reported that their child's income is essential for family maintenance, the corresponding percentage in case of drop-out children in paid non-agricultural work is 73.6. In other words, the income of a higher percentage of drop-outs children in paid non-agricultural work is additional than it is in agricultural work. Further, in High Drop-out areas the child's earning is not so essential as it is in Low Drop-out areas. Alternatively the income of the child in High Drop-out areas in such cases is only an additional income.

Child Labour and Drop-out Phenomenon in Karnataka State

As per the estimates of the 1971 census for Karnataka State, 7.55 per cent of children in the age group 0-14 are workers in rural areas. School going children are not included under workers. There are four categories of children in 0-14 age range with respect to school participation and drop-out phenomenon. (refer Table 29). The first category refers to children in the age group 0-4. (Below 5 years of age). The second category refers to those children who had been enrolled to schools and who dropped out later. They are the drop-outs. The third category refers to school going children. The fourth category to these children who were not at all enrolled to schools. The percentage of children who are in the 0-4 age group are estimated to be 45.0 per cent of the population in 0-14 age range. These children may be considered to be non-workers. This leaves out another 55.0 per cent who are in the age group 5-14. With the enrolment drive that has been reported to be successful (with 100.0 per cent enrolment in primary schools) only one per cent margin of error may be allowed for non-enrolment. As such we are left with 54.0 per cent of children in the age group 0-14 who are either school going or drop-outs. As per an estimate of decreasing enrolment in the seven standards of primary education at the time of reference of the study and increasing drop-out rates alternatively, it is computed from average drop-out rate for three year period in standards I to VII from 80 schools spread over five Low Drop-out and five High Drop-out talukas in the study that 36.0 per cent of children will be drop-outs and 64.0 per cent will be school-going. The figure of 36.0 per cent is perhaps little low as compared to estimates of other studies. This is because in this study, as per the design, out of ten talukas considered, five are essentially Low Drop-out talukas. As such the figure obtained might have been pulled down. The break up of 54.0 per cent drop-out and school going children in the age-group 0-14 of the general population in 36 to 64 ratio works out to be 20 drop-out children and 34 school going children.

The present study has covered 1878 drop-outs in various regions and Low-High Drop-out areas in the State. 20.1 per cent of these drop-outs are working. This includes paid agricultural labour as well as non-agricultural labour. If for 100 drop-outs, 20 are working, then for 20 drop-outs (the estimate of drop-outs in the State in the age group 0-14), the figure would be 4.0 The State figure of child labour in 0-14 age group is 7.55. This figure of 7.55 is constituted out of 4.0 per cent drop-outs and 3.55 others. This means that 55.0 per cent of child labourers in the State are drop-outs from schools. The figure of 3.55% of child labour in the State in the category 'others' will leave one wondering whether there is 100.0 per cent enrolment in the State ? Is it true that a great majority are non-enrolled ?

Data of this study indicate that a higher incidence of child labour is associated with a high drop-out phenomenon. If there are 22.4 per cent paid agricultural, non-agricultural labourers among drop-outs in High Drop-out areas of the State, the figure for Low Drop-out areas is 17.8 per cent.

The percentage of drop-outs engaged in paid agricultural and non-agricultural labour were pooled up separately for Low and High Drop-out areas of different regions. By doing this, 5 values for Low and 5 values for High Drop-out areas were obtained. Means and Standard Deviations of these 5 pooled up values each were computed. Using the obtained valves of Means and Standard Deviations, the 't' test (for significance of difference between Means) was administered. It is observed that the difference between the Means of percentages of drop-outs engaged in paid labour between High and Low Drop-out areas is not significant either at the 0.01 or at the 0.05 levels though it is apparent that a higher percentage of drop-outs are engaged in paid labour in High Drop-out areas than that of these in Low Drop-out areas.

S.C.E.R.T., West Bengal
Library
Calcutta
25/3, B. C. Road

CHAPTER V

NON-SCHOOL FACTORS

Information was collected on certain non-school factors also which may have an indirect bearing on withdrawal of children from school. One of these factors relates to the practices of mortgaging children as bonded labours by the parents (Table not presented in the report). It has been observed that only ten parents reported that they had mortgaged their drop-out children as beyond labourers. Out of them eight are boys and two are girls. Seven out of eight boys are in low drop-out areas of the different regions of the State except the dry region. The other boy drop-out is from the High Drop-out wet area. The two girls reported as bonded labourers are from High Drop-out Industrial Belts. It has been observed that children are mortgaged for a period extending from less than a year to even more than five years, and for amounts of money which may range from below Rs. 200/- to nearly Rs. 1000/-. These children work as field hands, house assistants, care takers of small children and in several other miscellaneous jobs. They are mostly mortgaged to non-relatives. Though the incidence of bonded labour in the State is in the order of 0.5 only, still it is possible that the figure may be slightly higher as many parents may not come out with correct information in this regard. Anyhow the percentage of bonded labourers who are children in the State as a whole is only 0.5. Nine children in the sample are physically handicapped.

Dowry and Drop-outs

Level of education of a person is a determinant of a person's status in society. A person's status regulates his roles and social relations. Marriage is one of those areas of social life which is regulated by such social relations. For instance it is a convention in Indian Society that in marital relationships the boy or the bridegroom should have attained a higher level of education than that of the girl or the bride. Higher the level of education of a girl still higher levels of education are expected from the would-be suitors of the girl. Further, higher the level of education of the boy/bridegroom, higher will be his ratings in a marriage market. In accordance with his ratings the expectations of the bridegroom and his family from the bride and her parents will also be high apart from a commensurate level of education. The would be in-laws (or) parents of a girl have to spend more money on the marriage of their ward and in several cases may also have to pay an amount demanded by the would be son-in-law or his family which is commonly referred to as dowry. The dowry to be paid for an illiterate girl may be less than that for one with education as the former may be married off to a boy who is also an illiterate or a little educated and who may not demand much from his would be in-laws. In case of the latter girl, the parent have to look for a higher educated boy and may have to pay a higher dowry. As such it would be perhaps advantageous for parents who cannot pay a high dowry and spend a heavier amount on marriage to give as minimum education as possible. There is one more advantage in examining a girl for marriage relations. It is customary for the boy and his family members to consider whether the would-be daughter-in-law is capable of and willing to do hard manual labour. The manual labour may range from looking after cattle or poultry at home to going as field hands or agricultural labourers or construction workers, etc. It is just as a upper middle class family examining whether their would-be daughter-in-law knows music, fine arts, household chores, tailoring, knitting etc. It is also similar to the present day expectations of an industrial worker in metropolitan cities looking for a working bride. Under the circumstances, the assumption is that a girl in a rural area from the lower class families may not be willing to take up manual labour if she is a little educated and may expect a little higher level of education on the part of her would-be husband. Then the parents have to go for a higher class level for marriage relations than what they are capable of which means a higher and additional expenditure on marriage. As such it would be safer not to educate the girl. This might be a very strong and unconscious motivational factor in the premature withdrawal of girls from school. An examination of drop-out phenomenon is made here in the light of the foregoing hypothesis. Data had been collected for the purpose.

Rural Marriage Data in Drop-out Families

895 girl drop-outs are covered in the study. They constitute 47.65 per cent of the total sample. In majority of these families, the expenses on marriage will be within Rs 3000/-. The percentage who constitute this majority is 54.3 (see Table 30 A). If the limit of Rs. 5000/- as expenditure on marriage is considered, then 80.0 per cent of the sample is covered. This amount of expenditure has to be looked in the context of their income data. It may be recalled that when Rs. 5000/- family income per annum was computed as the cut-off point of poverty line, then a great majority drop-out families in rural areas covered in the study existed far below the poverty line. They were chronically poor. As

such this amount of expense on a girl's marriage is quite a significant amount for them. It may work out to be nearly an year's annual income. It is only in High Drop-out hilly areas that in majority of drop-out families an amount exceeding Rs. 5000/- is spent on marriage. In all other talukas in the State a majority fall within Rs. 5000/- limit. Majority of families in three out of five Low Drop-out talukas in the State spend less than Rs. 3000/- on marriage while only one out of five High Drop-out taluka spend less than Rs. 3000/-. If Rs. 5000/- is considered as the ceiling expense on marriage then all low drop-out talukas fall within the ceiling while four High Drop-out talukas out of five fall within the ceiling.

78 per cent girl drop-out families in the State have reported that they have to pay dowry for their girl's marriage. (see Table 30-B). A higher percentage in Low Drop-out areas, 86.4 per cent have reported so as against 69.7 per cent in high drop-out areas. Majority of drop-out families have to pay dowry irrespective of low-high and regional variations. It is highest in Industrial Belts and lowest in coastal areas.

In majority of families (54.0 per cent), the bridegroom's party demand anywhere between Rs. 500/- to Rs. 2000/- as dowry (refer Table 30-C). Those families where less than Rs. 500/- is demanded as dowry is hardly 12.0 per cent. There are also 15.6 per cent families in whose kinship groups, the bridegroom's party demand anywhere between Rs. 2000/- to Rs. 3000/-. Altogether in over 80.0 per cent of families in rural areas taking various ranges of dowry demanded, the bridegroom's parties demand less than Rs. 3000/-. Not much difference is observed between Low and High Drop-out areas in the State in the practice of demanding dowry.

It is only in Low and High Drop-out areas of dry region and High Drop-out areas of Industrial Belt that a low but significant percentage of families have to pay less than Rs. 500/- as dowry. Otherwise in all the other areas and regions the lower limit by and large crosses Rs. 500/-. In low and high areas of hilly regions, majority of families have to pay more than Rs. 3000/- as dowry while in low areas of wet regions majority have to pay more than Rs. 2000/- as dowry. In all other areas and regions majority of families pay less than Rs. 2000/-. A slightly higher percentage of drop-out families in High Drop-out areas as compared to Low Drop-out areas have to pay less than Rs. 2000/- as dowry. The difference in the total percentage of families who have to pay less than Rs. 3000/- as dowry is almost nil between High and Low Drop-out areas.

The amount of dowry demanded by the bridegroom's party varies invariably with differing educational backgrounds of bridegrooms as well as their occupational backgrounds (see Table 30-D). Higher the educational background or better the occupational status such as in Govt. service, then the dowry to be paid will also be higher.

In the light of these rural marriage data it would be interesting to study the response pattern for the question put to the parents in the study ; "Is it because you may have to pay a higher dowry that you withdrew your child from school ?" As we observed the facial reactions of several parents when this question was put to them while we were supervising the work of field investigation we found a smile on their faces while other questions on marriage expenses and dowry were answered casually. This smile was apparent mostly in those who responded in the positive to this question. It may be observed that in the case of 13.6 per cent of parents of drop-out girls in the State, the prospect of a higher marriage expenditure inclusive of dowry has weighed much in withdrawing their daughters from schools. Though the figure of 13.6 is representative of the State, still it is valid only for the two High Drop-out areas of dry and wet regions. 88.0 per cent of those who have said that the prospect of a higher dowry and marriage expenses have weighed in their minds in withdrawing the daughters from school are from these two High Drop-out areas. In other words, nearly two out of every three girl drop-outs in High Drop-out areas of dry and wet regions are withdrawn from schools for consideration of dowry alongwith other reasons.

Failure in School and Drop-outs

One of the possible reasons for children dropping out of school is that they are unable to make grades in their schools and thus fail in their examinations at the end of the year. Once they fail, then the tendency would be to withdraw from school rather than sit in the same class for a second year. Data were collected and analysed in the context of this hypothesis. It is observed that only 8.4 per cent of drop-outs had failed at school before they dropped out (Table not given in the report). A slightly higher percentage of boys had failed than girls in the State as a whole and the Low and High Drop-out areas as well. Those who had failed and dropped out were highest in Low Drop-out areas of hilly region where the drop-out phenomenon is significant at higher primary levels. The failures were not significant in other regions of the State. As such further analysis of information about failed students was given up.

Incentive Schemes as Educational Stimuli

The Government of Karnataka has instituted through the Departments of Education and Social Welfare a number of incentive schemes to stimulate the interest of parents in sending their children to school regularly. Apart from this the school children are also covered under a mid-day meal programme. The knowledge, understanding and availability of these benefits on the part of parents may influence the participation of children in school. On the contrary, it may be hypothesised that lack of such knowledge and understanding of schemes as well as non-availability of such benefits in the past may also influence the withdrawal of children from school. In this light, data about knowledge and understanding of schemes on the part of parents of drop-out children in the past as well as benefits if any derived by drop-outs before the left school are analysed. The data collected cover mainly the mid-day meals scheme, the free supply of text-books scheme, the attendance scholarship scheme and the pre-matric scholarship scheme.

A great majority of parents are aware of the incentive schemes. At least three out of four parents are aware of such schemes. The awareness of total in dry High, Wet Low and Coastal High areas. It is around the State average in Low and High areas of hilly regions and high regions of Industrial Belt. It is quite low in wet high, dry low, coastal low and low areas of Industrial Belts of the State. In general, awareness of schemes is higeer in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas (Table not presented in the report).

A great majority of those who are aware of incentive schemes are found to be aware of more than one scheme (Table not presented in the report). This is true of all areas and regions of the State. Among those who are aware of Incentive Schemes, it is total with respect to Mid-day meals scheme in all areas and regions of the State and the State as a whole except in High Drop-out areas of wet regions where a significant minority are not aware of these schemes. Again, a considerable majority in the State are aware of free supply of text-books. This is true of all regions except the hilly region and Low Drop-out areas of Industrial Belts. With respect to other schemes such as the attendance scholarship and the pre-matric scholarship schemes, the awareness is quite low. Further, hardly a few are aware of pre-matric scholarship scheme.

Majority of those who have reported that they are aware of the schemes have just heard about the schemes. It is hardly 2.9 per cent of the total who are aware have full knowledge of the schemes such as information about eligibility, conditions of award, nature of benefit amount or value of benefit, etc. However, quite a few, around 35.0 per cent are aware of partial details about one or the other incentive schemes. The percentage of those who are aware of partial details of the incentive schemes are almost the same in low and high regions of the State (Table not presented in the report).

The parents come to know about the scheme mostly through neighbours (44.6 per cent), while an equal percentage have come to know about the schemes through the school teacher and the head master. (Table not presented in the report). The village leaders are hardly mentioned as a source of information, if at all they are partly significant as a source of information, they are so in low areas of wet regions. The school teacher or the head master are a prominent source of information in Low Drop-out areas while the neighbours are so in High Drop-out areas.

Those who have benefited from incentive schemes form a minority group (40.2 per cent). An equal number of parents have reported that they have not received any benefit for their children from the incentive schemes. (Table not given in the report). A slightly higher percentage of parents in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas have reported that their children had benefited from the incentive schemes.

It is observed that in terms of awareness of schemes and awareness of details about the schemes on the part of parents as well as the receipt of benefit, the High Drop-out areas fare as much as the Low Drop-out areas. As such the incentive schemes do not appear to have the differential effect on the withdrawal of children from the schools.

Parents and Their Drop-out Children

What do the parents feel about drop-out phenomenon ? What reasons do they offer for withdrawal of their children from school ? How do their reasoning tally with observed facts ? Table 31 provides information about parents' reasons for their children dropping out from school. The responses are presented in descending order of frequency of the total responses for each reason for the State as a whole.

Five reasons appear to be significant in the minds of parents for withdrawal of their children from school. These five reasons are considered as significant as more than 10.0 per cent of parents have reported these reasons. The reasons are in descending order of frequency for the State as a whole are 'poverty' (34.5 per cent) 'children needed to do household chores' (23.2 per cent), 'needed to take care of little ones' (18.2 per cent) ; 'lack of interest in school among their children' (15.1 per cent), and 'children needed to rear cattle' (14.6 per cent). A higher percentage of boys than girls are withdrawn for reasons of 'poverty', 'lack of interest in school', and 'to rear cattle'. While a higher percentage of girls than boys are withdrawn from school for the two reasons, 'to take care of little ones' and 'to do household chores'. It may be recalled that a great majority of parents in the sample get an income which puts them far below the poverty line. Further, a higher percentage of boys than girls are sent for paid agricultural as well as non-agricultural labour. A higher percentage of girls than boys are serviceable at home. As such parents' own perceptions of their behaviour in relation to their children's schooling very much tally with the facts of the case. There are a number of other reasons also as reported by parents for which children are withdrawn from schools. These reasons are 'ill health of parents', 'children needed to take care of house', 'school being distant from the home', 'children needed to support the family financially', 'teachers beating children', 'peer influence' etc. The percentage of responses under all these categories total up to 18.9 only. The total of all percentages for various reasons crosses 100.0 which indicates that there may be more than one reason for withdrawal of children from schools. Only one reason that stands out clearly not reported by parents as against the facts of the case is 'children needed to support the family financially'.

Though it has been observed in the study that 20.1 per cent of drop-outs are engaged in paid agricultural and non-agricultural work and a great majority of parents had reported that the income earned by these drop-outs in paid work was essential for maintenance of family, still hardly 1.0% of parents have reported this as their reason for withdrawal of children from school. In effect, the fact that children are withdrawn from school as they are required to do paid work and support the family is concealed by the parents.

Regional Variations in Parents' Perceptions of Reasons for Withdrawal of their Children from School

It is observed that 'poverty' is the over-riding reason for withdrawal of children from school. Reports of poverty from parents are highest in dry areas of the State (53.2 per cent). 'Need for children to do household chores' is reported as another significant reason all over the State. 'Care of little ones' as a reason is reported as a significant one in coastal areas and Industrial Belts. 'Rearing cattle' appears a significant reason in wet areas of the State.

If a higher percentage of parents in low over high drop-out areas have reported 'poverty', 'attending to household chores' and 'rearing cattle' as reasons for withdrawal of children from school, in contrast, a higher percentage of parents in High over Low Drop-out areas have reported 'care of little ones' and 'lack of interest in school work' as reasons for withdrawal of their children from school.

Drop-outs and their Ex-teachers

Several complaints are heard that teachers in rural areas do not come to school regularly, teachers beat children, etc. Sometimes these reasons are cited as responsible for drop-out phenomenon. The parents of drop-out children were asked questions about the regularity of attendance of teachers to the village school and the practice of teachers beating children keeping in view such complaints. On the basis of data obtained in the study it was observed that the cases of reports about irregularity of teachers are quite low and negligible (Table not given in the report). To be precise, hardly in 1.9 per cent of cases, parents have reported about irregular/regular attendance of teachers. This is true of Low and High Drop-out areas of all regions.

Further, it was observed that a great majority (80.2 per cent) of parents have reported that teachers do not beat children. Still, it is observed that nearly one out of every five teachers in rural areas beats children in school. Cases of teachers beating children is higher in Low Drop-out areas than in High Drop-out areas. It is quite high in low areas of wet regions and high areas of Industrial Belts. However, a great majority of parents (76.6 per cent) approved of the practice of teachers beating children (Table not given in the report). Such approval is more preminent in low drop-out areas as compared to high drop-out areas. It is only in High Drop-out areas of wet, hilly areas and Industrial Belts that a significant percentage of parents disapprove of the practice of beating children.

The parents had been finally asked whether they withdrew the children as their children were being beaten by teachers. In response to this question, 8.2 per cent of parents have reported in the positive (Table not included in the report). As such one out of twelve drop-outs is being withdrawn from school for the reason 'teacher beats children' as per parents' report.

CHAPTER VI

SCHOOL FACILITIES : A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LOW AND HIGH DROP-OUT AREAS AS WELL AS DIFFERENT REGIONS IN THE STATE

The phenomenon of children dropping out of school is commonly observed all over the State. However, the rate or the extent of dropping out differs from region to region and within the region itself. Such variations could be attributed to several factors operating from within the school system as well as outside of it.

It has been observed in this study that in order of significance the following reasons appear to influence the premature withdrawal of children from school. They are : (*a*) poor socio-economic background of parents referring to a low level of education, agriculture based occupation, poor status with respect to size and nature of landholding or even landlessness, lower positions in caste hierachy alongwith chronic poverty ; (*b*) need for children to work in home management activities ranging in order of participation from carrying water to the home, care of little ones, care of cattle, work assistance to parents to several minor jobs; (*c*) need for children to take up paid agricultural and non-agricultural labour; (*d*) children being beaten at school by their teachers; (*e*) prospects of higher marriage expenses associated with education of girls, etc. These influences are in addition to strong indications about a poor quality of the teaching-learning process in the initial stages of schooling. A detailed analysis of data with reference to all these factors of drop-out behaviour has already been covered earlier. These factors are external to the school system. However, there may be a host of school factors like rigid school timings, ill-equipped schools, inadequate buildings, lack of teachers, poor quality of teachers, poor community school relations, etc. which may also contribute to a considerable extent to the drop-out phenomenon. Several research studies of drop-out phenomenon have focussed mainly on social, economic and other family and enviromental factors of drop-out phenomenon. Researches about the contribution of school factors to drop-out phenomenon are relatively very low. However, a realisation that school factors may also contribute to the drop-out phenomenon as much as non-school factors is gaining momentum.

Drop-out phenomenon is analysed in this study in the framework of school factors also. The analysis of data is mostly in terms of comparison of school factors between low and high drop-out areas and among regions. The major variables covered are teacher, school plant, school equipment, incentive schemes, co-curricular activities and community participation.

Profile of schools covered

As decided earlier (refer to methodology and sample section) 62 villages were covered from five Low Drop-out as well as five High Drop-out talukas. There were 30 villages in Low Drop-out areas and 32 villages in High Drop-out areas. The educational facilities in all these areas and regions are nearly the same except in coastal areas. As the policy was to cover all the primary schools in sample villages, the number of schools covered in coastal areas has been high. Out of the 80 schools covered, 46 schools are lower primary schools with I to IV standards and the rest are higher or model primary schools with I-VII standards. The percentage of single teacher schools works out to be around 75.0 per cent. With reference to lower primary schools with I to IV standards only and 42.5 per cent when their number is considered against the total primary schools covered in the study including I to IV and I to VII standards. There is no single teacher school in sampled villages of Hilly Low drop-out areas (Mercara taluka). Higher number of single teacher schools are found in coastal region of the State.

The percentage of single teacher schools in Low Drop-out areas of the State is 62.0 while that for the High Drop-out areas is 84.0. The difference of 22.0 per cent was subjected to 't' test analysis. A 't' value of 3.33 was obtained. This is significant at 0.01 level. Hence the proportion of single teacher schools in an area may influence the drop-out behaviour of children.

School factors in drop-out phenomenon : The Teacher

Teacher-Pupil Ratio

It may be recalled that there are 134 teachers in 38 primary schools of Low Drop-out areas and 123 teachers in 42 primary schools of High Drop-out areas (vide Table 32). Primary schools comprise of single teacher Lower Primary Schools, Multi-teacher Lower Primary Schools and Higher Primary Schools including Model Primary Schools.

The teacher-pupil ratio was computed for Low and High Drop-out areas using enrolment data (vide Table 33). It was observed that the teacher-pupil ratio is slightly lower in primary schools of Low Drop-out areas than it is in primary schools of High Drop-out areas. If there is one teacher for every 41 students in Low Drop-out areas, there is one teacher for 48 children in High Drop-out areas. There is no difference in teacher-pupil ratio of single teacher schools in both the areas. There is only one teacher for teaching on an average 52 children enrolled in I-IV standards of primary education in both Low and High Drop-out areas. However, if there is one teacher for 33 children in Multi-teacher Lower Primary Schools of Low Drop-out areas, the ratio is 1 : 49 in Multi-teacher Lower Primary Schools of High Drop-out areas. Again, the position of Low Drop-out areas with respect to teacher-pupil ratio in Higher Primary Schools is better (1 : 39) than that in High Drop-out areas (1 : 49).

Even when standard-wise teacher strength is considered, it is observed that the teacher per standard ratio in Low Drop-out areas is 0.63 while it is 0.54 in High Drop-out areas.

Sex of Teachers

69.0 per cent of schools in the State have no female teachers. All have male teachers. Another 26.0 per cent have teachers of both sexes. Only 5.0 per cent of the schools have all female teachers. Schools where all teachers are female are in equal proportions in both Low and High Drop-out areas. Low Drop-out areas have a slightly higher percentage of schools with teachers of both sexes than that of High Drop-out areas. Alternatively the percentage of schools with all male teachers is slightly lower in Low Drop-out areas than those in High Drop-out areas. Low Drop-out hilly area (Mercara) where drop-out rate at the initial stages of schooling is quite low as compared to other areas and regions has no school where only men teachers are there. Only in coastal regions and low drop-out areas of hilly region there are some schools where all teachers are female.

Teachers' Place of Residence

One out of two teachers in primary schools in the State does not stay in the village he serves. That is, 50.0 per cent of teachers commute to the school from outside. However, it was observed that the Low Drop-out areas do not fare as well as the High Drop-out areas in terms of the break up of local and non-local teachers. In fact majority of teachers in High Drop-out areas are local while majority in Low Drop-out areas are non-local. This data should be read as only an observed data. It should not be inferred that if teachers do not stay in the village they serve, then the drop-out rates will go down.

A high percentage of teachers commute to the school from outside in Industrial Belts (especially Bangarpet). In fact five out of six teachers are commuters to the school.

Training of Teachers

There is not a single school in Karnataka State which is exclusively maintained by untrained teachers. Three out of four schools have teachers who are all trained. Only 24.0 per cent of the schools have some untrained teachers. These untrained teachers are usually the stipendary graduates.

Almost all the schools in Wet High, Coastal Low and High, Hilly Low, and IB Low areas have all trained teachers. A slightly higher percentage of schools in High Drop-out areas (79.0 per cent) have all trained teachers than those in Low Drop-out areas (74.0 per cent). However, the percentage of trained teachers in the same (86.0 per cent) in both Low and High Drop-out areas.

Teachers by Length of Service

Those schools which have teachers who have put in less than 20 years of service constitute the higher percentage (40.0%) group in the State. The Low Drop-out areas have a slightly higher percentage of such schools (42.0 per cent) than that of High Drop-out areas (38.0 per cent). Further, schools which have teachers with more than 20 years of service are higher in High Drop-out areas (31.0 per cent) than those in Low Drop-out areas (13.0 per cent).

The Low Drop-out areas also have a higher proportion of teachers (42 out of 134 or 31.0 per cent) who are young and relatively less experienced (within ten years of experience) than the same in High Drop-out areas (34 out of 123 or 27.0 per cent.)

The School Plant

Location of the Village : Majority of villages covered in the study lie far away from the main road Nearly one out of four schools only is situated on the main road (taluka high way or bus route). The Low Drop-out areas score over the High Drop-out areas with respect to location of villages on the main road.

In fact only one out of four villages, covered in the study has a pucca road. The Low Drop-out areas again score over the High Drop-out areas in terms of availability of a pucca approach road. By and large the villages are far away from the main road in Coastal Regions and High Drop-out areas of Industrial Belts and Hilly Regions. Majority of villages in all areas and regions except the Low areas of Wet regions do not have a pucca road to the village.

Location of the School

Though majority of the villages are located far away from the main road, still majority of the villages (60.0 per cent) have schools within the village itself. Again one out of four villages (27.5 per cent) have school facility near the village itself (½ km. distance). However, there are still a few villages (one out of eight or 12.5 per cent) for which the school is far away. A higher percentage of villages in Low Drop-out areas (68.4 per cent) have a school in the village itself than that of High Drop-out areas (52.4 per cent). In quite a number of villages itself in High Drop-out areas, it is at least near to the village. Only in coastal, hilly regions, and low areas of wet regions, there are some schools which are far away from the villages. All the schools in Low areas of Dry regions and High areas of Wet regions are located in the village itself.

Type of Building

A great majority of schools covered in the study have a pucca building. All the schools in Dry High, Low and High of Wet regions and Low IB have pucca building. There is not much difference between Low and High Drop-out areas with respect to nature of school building.

Though a great majority of schools have pucca building, still, they are mostly buildings with tiled rooves. Again, there is not much difference between Low and High Drop-out areas with respect to nature of roofing. In Wet High, Hilly Low and High, IB Low and High Drop-out areas, all the school buildings have tiled rooves.

Only five out of 80 schools covered in the study have RCC rooves, four of them being located in High Drop-out areas of Dry regions and the other one in Low Drop-out areas of Wet regions.

There are also some schools in the State though a few and negligible in number, which have thatched rooves.

Almost all the schools (92.5 per cent) in the State have their own buildings, out of which a few (10.0 per cent) are donated buildings. As such though there are schools which are run in rented buildings or religious abodes still their proportion to the total is quite low. Rented buildings (3 out of 80) are there in High Drop-out areas of Coastal and Hilly regions.

There are also three schools which are run in temples and mosques. These schools are located in Low Wet, Low Coastal and High IB regions.

The position of Low and High Drop-out areas with respect to possession of buildings is almost the same.

School Size

It may be recalled that 3 out of 80 schools in the State are run in mosques and temples. The others have a school building. An analysis of these school buildings with respect to their size in terms of the number of class-rooms was made. It was observed that 45.0 per cent of the schools in the State are run in a single class room. Another 40.0 per cent of schools have more than one class room but not one room for each class. Hardly 13.75 per cent of the schools in the State have one room for each standard of primary education.

The Low Drop-out areas fare better than the High Drop-out areas with respect to size of school building. Majority of the schools in High Drop-out areas (57.0 per cent) are run in single rooms, while the percentage of such schools in Low Drop-out areas is 31.6%. The Low Drop-out areas have 18.4 per cent of schools with such buildings and have one room for each standard of primary education. While the figures for High Drop-out areas is 9.5 per cent only.

There is not a single school in Low Drop-out areas of Hilly region (Mercara Taluka) which is run in only one class-room. A great majority of such schools are there in High Drop-out areas of coastal and hilly regions.

Drinking Water Facility

45.0 per cent of the schools in the State do not have drinking water facility for children in the school. Further majority of schools in High Drop-out areas (54.7 per cent) do not have drinking water facility. The percentage of such schools in Low Drop-out areas is 35.2.

At least 50.0 per cent of schools in High Drop-out areas of Dry, Coastal and Hilly regions and all the schools in High Drop-out areas of Industrial Belts do not have drinking water facility. 95.0 per cent of schools do not have urinal or toilet facility.

Assets of the School

One out of three schools in the State have some assets for the school. The asset may be land, coffee estate, coconut garden or even a well with or without a pumpset. A higher percentage of schools in Low Drop-out areas (42.0 per cent) have such assets that those in High Drop-out areas (26.0 per cent).

School Equipment in Rural Areas and Drop-out rate

(Note : Dr. K Venkatasubramanian, suggested in his review of the study that the criteria 'adequacy, should have been used in an analysis of school equipment data. This is a very valuable suggestion. However, criteria for adequacy are not readily available with the DSERT or the primary education wing of the DPI It is felt that operational definition by reseachers would be subjective. An alternative would be criteria rating by experts. Though it is worthwhile this could not be done for want of time. An independent study is being proposed for this).

Black Board : A great majority of schools in the State do not have at least one blackboard per standard of primary education. The percentage of such schools is around 64.0 of the total. Majority of schools in all the five regions are like this. The imbalance is greater with respect to Industrial Belts and Hilly areas.

Position of Black-Board in Lower Primary Schools

There are 13 single teacher schools in Low Drop-out areas of the State and 21 such schools in High Drop-out areas. 6 out of 13 schools in LDA (Low Drop-out area) have only one blackboard while the number of such schools in HDA (HighDrop-out area) is 4 out of 21. It appears that with respect to command of blackboard facility the Single Teacher Schools in HDA are better than those in LDA. There are four out of twenty one in LDA which have one or more than one blackboard for each standard of Lower Primary Education, while there are five such schools in HDA. In all, there are 51 blackboards for 21 schools in LDA and 65 blackboards for 25 schools in HDA. While most of the blackboards in LDA are either fixed to the wall or those which have a stand, quite a number of blackboards in HDA are either rolling boards or those without stand.

In terms of blackboard facility, the LDA and HDA do not appear to differ much except that the HDA has a higher percentage of rolling and blackboards without stand. The position in both the LDA and HDA is disappointing in terms of adequacy of blackboards defined as one blackboard per standard of primary education.

Position of Blackboard in Higher Primary Schools

17 higher primary schools have been covered in both LDA and HDA. 12 out of 17 schools in LDA have either one or more than one blackboard per standard of primary

education, while there are only 9 such schools in HDA. The 17 schools in LDA have 146 blackboards while there are 133 blackboards for 17 schools in HDA. Blackboards without stand or rolling boards are in slightly higher proportion in HDA than in LDA.

The position of higher primary schools in LDA with respect to blackboards facility appears to be better than that in HDA. Still, more than one out of every three higher primary schools in the State do not have one blackboard for each standard of primary education.

Seating Facility in Lower Primary School

Children in 8 out of 21 in LDA and 13 out of 25 in HDA have to sit on floor in LPS. In five out of eight schools in LDA there is no other seating facility while there are four such out of thirteen schools in HDA. In the other schools seating facility in terms of benches with desks, ordinary benches or wooden planks are there. Assuming that five children can be seated in a bench or a plank or a bench with desk, it is observed that two out of every three children enrolled in Lower Primary Schools of LDA have seating facility at school while only one out of two children has such a facility in HDA. Seating facility by and large means benches and planks. The number of desks with benches is very small. The LDA appears to fare better than the HDA with respect to seating facility.

Position in Higher Primary Schools

In 5 out of 17 and 11 out of 17 Higher Primary Schools in LDA and HDA respectively, children sit on the floor. Floor is the only furniture in three schools of LDA and four schools of HDA. While 4 out of 5 children have seating facility in terms of benches, desks with benches or planks in Higher Primary Schools of LDA, one out of four children can boast of such a facility in Higher Primary Schools of

HDA. The HDA are far inferior to the LDA in terms of seating facility.

Furniture for Staff

Position in Lower Primary Schools : There are two schools in LDA and one school in HDA which do not have a chair for the teacher to sit down in the class. Further, there are three schools in LDA and one school in HDA which do not have a table also. Quite a few schools are there without either a steel cup-board or a wooden almirah. The number of such schools in LDA is 13 (out of 21) and in HDA 10 (out of 25). There is also a school in LDA which does not have any furniture including wooden boxes or stool. There is no safe place to keep the records of the school.

Position in Higher Primary Schools : The position in Higher Primary Schools with respect to furniture for staff is better than that in Lower Primary Schools. Out of 34 Higher Primary Schools in the State, in only one school (in LDA) teachers have no chairs and have to use stools only. All schools in the State have at least one table. But there are five schools, two in LDA and three in HDA which do not have an almirah or cup-board.

The LDA appears to fare better than the HDA with respect to furniture for staff. While for 17 schools with 95 teachers in LDA there are 115 chairs, 81 tables, 52 almirahs and 24 other types of furniture (stool or wooden/steel trunks), in HDA for 91 teachers in 17 schools again there are 93 chairs, 69 tables, 40 almirahs and 29 other types of furniture.

Maps

Position with respect to Lower Primary Schools

Out of 46 Lower Primary Schools in the State, 2 schools, both of them in Low Drop-out areas do not have even a single map. 17 out of 21 schools in LDA and 21 out of 25 schools in HDA do not have a world map. Again, 19 schools in LDA and 24 in HDA do not have maps of continents. These maps, however, may not be very useful for Lower Primary School in terms of syllabus requirements. But, a map of India is essential for Lower Primary Schools. 6 schools in LDA out of 21 and 14 in HDA out of 25 do not have a map of India. Further, only 2 out of 21 schools have a map of Karnataka in LDA while no school in HDA has such a map. However, many schools in both LDA and HDA have District Maps. Only 7 in LDA and 4 in HDA do not have a District Map. All the schools in LDA and 22 schools out of 25 in HDA do not have a taluka map. In all, there are 75 maps for 21 schools in LDA and 84 maps for 25 schools in HDA.

Position with respect to Higher Primary Schools

The position of Higher Primary Schools with respect to maps appear to be better as compared to that of Lower Primary Schools. 17 schools each in LDA and HDA have a total of 191 and 250 maps respectively. There is not a single school in either LDA or HDA which does not have a map of India or a map of Karnataka State. All the schools in HDA even have the District Map while there are four schools in LDA which do not have a District Map. Though the Higher Primary Schools are required as per the syllabus to teach about other continents and countries, still there are 3 schools in LDA and 1 school in HDA which do not have maps of continents Again, one school in LDA and 3 schools in HDA do not have World Map. Most of the schools in HDA and all the schools in LDA do not have a taluka map.

Charts

Position in Lower Primary Schools

There is only one Lower Primary School in the State (in LDA) which does not have any chart. All other schools have some chart or the other. However, there are two schools in LDA and four schools in HDA which do not have the alphabetical charts. On an average the LDA and HDA have thirteen charts each per school. In all, there are 277 charts for 21 schools in LDA and 337 charts for 25 schools in HDA. But, while 12 out of 21 schools in LDA fall below the average, 18 out of 25 fall below the average in HDA.

Majority of schools in both LDA and HDA do not have flower charts, bird charts and charts required for teaching social studies, including civics, health and hygiene, time and seasons. In addition, majority of schools in HDA do not have number charts, animal charts and charts required for teaching life sciences, and mathematics. However, most of the schools have alphabetical charts and story telling charts.

Position in Higher Primary Schools

All Higher Primary Schools in the State possess charts. Most of the schools have charts for alphabets, life sciences, mathematics story telling and health/hygiene. Majority of schools in the State do not have time charts and season charts. In addition, majority of schools in LDA do not have flower charts and charts useful for teaching civics. There are 449 charts for 17 schools in LDA averaging 26 charts per school and 654 charts in 17 schools in HDA averaging 38 charts per school. However, only 7 schools in both LDA and HDA are above the respective averages.

Pictures

Majority of LPS have photos or pictures of National Leaders. There are 3 schools in LDA and 9 schools in HDA which do not have any such photo or pictures. A few schools have pictures of State Leaders also. Further, a few schools have displayed the school photo also. But their number is quite small and negligible. On an average, there are over 3 photos per school in both LDA and HDA. However, 13 out of 21 schools in LDA and 16 out of 25 schools in HDA fall below this average.

Not a single HPS in the State is there without photos/ pictures. All the HPS in LDA and all but one in HDA have photos of national leaders. A few schools have photos of State leaders also. Majority of schools in HDA have school photo also. On an average there are 8.4 photos per school in LDA and 7.0 per school in HDA. But, majority of the schools fall below this average.

Teaching Aids

Teaching aids are required to teach science, mathematics, and social studies in addition to languages. Majority of Lower Primary Schools in both LDA and HDA do not have teaching aids. There are 52 teaching aids in the 21 schools in LDA and 18 teaching aids in 25 schools in HDA, averaging 2.5 and 0.72 each respectively 18 out of 21 schools in LDA and 22 out of 25 schools in HDA fall below the averages.

The Higher Primary Schools fare better than Lower Primary Schools with respect to possession of teaching aids. There is only one school in both LDA and HDA without any teaching aid. Majority of schools in both the areas have teaching aids in science, mathematics and social studies. 17 schools each in LDA and HDA have a total of 61 and 65 teaching aids averaging 3.6 and 3.8 per school respectively. However, majority of schools in both LDA and HDA fall below this average.

Facilities for Physical Education

Play Ground Facility : Majority of schools in the State do not have playground facility. Hardly 46.25 per cent of the schools in the State have playground facility. However, majority of Higher Primary Schools have a playground of their own. 8 out of 21 LPS and 11 out of 17 HPS in LDA have play ground facility while 11 out of 25 LPS and 7 out of 17 HPS in HDA have playground facility. Though, many of the schools do not have playground facility still they have facilities for physical education.

Play Equipment

Majority of Lower Primary Schools in the State conduct physical education. However, still 2 out of 5 schools in the State do not have any facility for physical education. Facilities for physical education include possession of lazeams, dumb-bells, rings, hoops, sticks, etc. There are only two schools in the State (in LDA) which have all these materials. 2 out of 21 schools in LDA and 5 out of 25 in HDA possess five types of materials. Again five schools each in LDA and HDA possess four types of materials.

All the Higher Primary Schools in the State have facilities for physical education. Only one school (which is in HDA) has all materials including lazeams, dumb-bells, rings, hoops, sticks, etc. The schools in LDA are better off than those in HDA with respect to possession of these materials.

Facilities for Sports and Games : Majority of the Primary Schools in the State (59.0 per cent) do not have facilities for either indoor or outdoor sports and games. The schools in High Drop-out areas are slightly better than those in Low Drop-out areas with respect to provision of facilities for sports and games. This is true both at the Lower and Higher Primary Stages of Education. An equal number of Higher Primary Schools (7 out of 17) in Low and High Drop-out areas have facilities for both indoor and outdoor sports and games.

Co-curricular Activities : A great majority of schools conduct co-curricular activities in the school. They Conduct activities like debates, music, drama, essay-writing, drawing and painting and either put up science exhibition on their own or send children to participate in the same. The frequency of organising these activities is quite low in Lower Primary Schools. Except music or singing competition which is conducted by majority of Lower Primary Schools in both LDA and HDA, all other activities are organised by a few schools only. However, a great majority of Higher Primary Schools in both LDA and HDA conduct all these activities except drawing and painting and science exhibitions. Still there are two Higher Primary Schools in the State, one in LDA and one in HDA, which do not conduct any co-curricular activities.

Library Books

Data are available properly for 16 out of 21 LPS in LDA and 19 out of 25 in HDA. Similarly data about library books are available properly for 15 out of 17 HPS in LDA and 16 out of 17 in HDA.

The LPS on an average have 131 library books in LDA while the LPS in HDA have 115 books on an average. But majority of schools in both LDA (62.5 per cent) and HDA (73.7 per cent) fall below the average.

Similarly the Higher Primary Schools in LDA and HDA have 859 and 862 library books on an average for each school. Here also a marginal majority of schools fall below the average. The library collections include text-books, reference books fiction, etc. On a crude average there are not even 3 books per student in primary education.

Wall Clock and Time Piece in Schools

A great majority of Lower Primary Schools do not have either wall clock or time piece. The percentage of such schools is slightly higher in High Drop-out areas. 8 out of 21 LPS in LDA have either wall clock or time piece, while there are 4 such out of 25 schools in HDA. Not a single LPS has both wall clock and time piece.

But, there are a few Higher Primary Schools in both LDA and HDA which have wall clock as well as time piece. 13 out of 17 schools in LDA, and 15 out of 17 schools in HDA at Higher Primary Stage have the facility of wall clock or time piece or both.

Incentive Schemes and Drop-out Rates

Data about the Incentive Schemes implemented by the 80 schools during 1979-80 covered in the study are analysed and compared for Low and High Drop-out areas to examine whether the implementation has been more vigorous in Low Drop-out areas than in High Drop-out areas. The purpose was to find out differences, if any, in the nature and number of schemes in force in the schools of Low and High Drop-out areas. The schemes covered were, the attendance scholarship, the mid-day meals, the free supply of text-books, the pre-matric and the merit scholarships (the last two only for Higher Primary Schools) alongwith other scholarships such as those for ex-servicemen, backward classes, physically handicapped, etc. It was planned to further examine the data for utilisation against enrolment in LPS and HPS for the various areas and regions for all schemes. However, data obtained in the study indicate that the High Drop-out areas fare better than the Low Drop-out areas with respect to the number of schemes in force in both LPS and HPS except with respect to the free-supply of text-books and scholarship for ex-servicemen at the Lower Primary Stage. As such further analysis of data with respect to percentage of beneficiaries against enrolment in Low and High Drop-out areas was given up. However, it may be interesting to observe that considering all the primary schools, only the mid-day meals and the free supply of text-book schemes are in force in a high percentage of schools : 49 per cent and 44 per cent respectively in the State. Further, the pre-matric scholarship scheme is in force in 44.0 per cent of schools. Higher Primary Schools hardly three Lower Primary Schools are there in the sample, one in LDA and two in HDA (out of a total of 46 Lower Primary Schools—21 in LDA and 25 in HDA) where the attendance scholarship scheme is in force. As such none of the various incentive scheme is implemented in a large majority of the schools.

Community Participation

The participation of the local community with the schools covered in the study was examined in terms of data about the School Betterment Committee. It is observed that all the schools in the State have School Betterment Committees. Further, all the schools except three, two in High Drop-out area and one in Low Drop-out areas of Industrial Belt have reported that they organise periodically the meetings of the SBC. A great majority of schools organise 3-4 meetings in a year in both Low and High Drop-out areas. There are by and large 6-7 members in all these SBC's. More than 70 per cent of the members in both Low and High Drop-out areas attend the SBC meetings regularly.

The SBC's also contribute in kind and cash to the welfare of the school. While 19 out of 80 schools have contributed in cash, 33 out of 80 schools have contributed in kind. The SBC's in High Drop-out areas fare as well as those in Low Drop-out areas in terms of contribution either in cash or in kind. However, on a crude average it was observed that the cash contributions by SBC's in Low Drop-out area is slightly higher than that in High Drop-out areas. The cash contributions are more frequent in SBC's of Higher Primary Schools than those of Lower Primary Schools SBC's in slightly higher number of Lower Primary Schools have contributed in kind than in cash. The contributions in kind refer mainly to construction of class rooms and supply of materials for construction and repair of buildings, furniture and equipment Instances of donation of text-books and stationery or clothes, library books, wall clock, radio, fire-wood for preparation of mid-day meals etc., have also been observed. Even the cash donated to the school by the SBC's is used mainly for building construction and repairs and purchase of furniture and equipment to the school In some places it has been used for distributing clothes and books among children and also for organisation and management of children's sports.

CHAPTER VII

HIGHLIGHTS AND POLICY IMPERATIVES
NON-SCHOOL FACTORS

Highlights of the Study and Policy Imperatives

SECTION A

The study on drop-out phenomenon in rural areas made here is an attempt to analyse the problems of schooling in general and school drop-out phenomenon in particular in the context of integrated rural development. The policy imperatives emanating from the study will not only include needed efforts to maximise participation of children from all sections of society in the schooling process but also those needed to improve the levels of living and levels of welfare of children in rural areas which in turn have a direct bearing on school participation.

Stage of Schooling and Drop-out Phenomenon

One significant feature of drop-out phenomenon that emerges clearly even after considering regional, Low-High, and sex variations in analysis of data is that the drop-out phenomenon is essentially observed in the initial stages of schooling and specifically at the first standard stage. Irrespective of all variations, one out of two to three drop-outs leave school at the first standard stage itself. Further, two to three out of every four drop-outs leave school before completing the second standard stage. A minimum of three out of four children leave school before completing the Lower Primary Stage of Education.

It is only in hilly areas that the problem of drop-outs is felt both at the Lower and Higher Primary Stages. In other areas the problem is acute mainly at the Lower Primary Stage.

The Low-High variations in drop-out rates are caused not because of variations in either Lower Primary or Higher Primary Stages but because of variations only at first standard stage of Lower Primary Stage. The High Drop-out areas register a higher drop-out rate at the first standard stage than the Low Drop-out areas.

A higher percentage of girls than boys drop-out in the initial stages in Industrial Belts, Hilly and Wet areas. Highest differences between boys and girls in drop-out behaviour at the first standard stage are observed in wet areas of the State. In other words, highest percentage of girls drop-out at the first standard stage in wet areas as compared to boys.

In general the pressure point for children to leave school appears to be the first standard stage of primary education. The problem of retention of children in school is basically a problem of retaining them at the initial stage of Lower Primary Education.

It is observed that a great majority of children who had dropped out of school at the initial stage of schooling had not learnt anything at school. Their proportion is higher in high drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas.

Policy Imperatives

Serious efforts should be made to get the children learn the alphabets right from the first day they attend school and progressively to enable them to learn reading, writing and number work. If by the end of the first year children are enable to read the prescribed text-book with ease, write all the alphabet, write the 'Kagunitha', do simple additions and substractions, etc., then they would be self-motivated to attend school. Parents also satisfy themselves about the values of school attendance. However, care should be taken to avoid boredom for children while teaching the 3 R's.

School inspection in primary schools should be focussed towards this objective. At least one child in every school who can perform these tasks and is from either Scheduled Caste or chronically economically deprived class or both may be given a cash incentive of a minimum of Rs. 25/-. This may be announced in the beginning of the year. The total expenditure on this account is estimated to be around 7.5 lakhs per year.

Family Background of Drop-outs

Drop-outs are mostly from illiterate families. In only one out of six cases of drop-outs the parents or the elders had obtained primary education or beyond that. A great majority of drop-outs were first generation participants to the school. The percentage of such children was slightly higher in High Drop-out areas.

Three out of four drop-outs are from agricultural families. A higher percentage of drop-outs from non-agricultural families are there in High Drop-out areas rather than in Low Drop-out areas. Further, a higher proportion of mothers in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas are agricultural labourers though it was observed that a marginal majority of mothers of drop-out children in the State are housewives.

Only three out of five families of drop-outs own lands. Majority of parents who own lands have only marginal farms. 28.4 per cent of drop-outs' parents have reported that they are landless.

80.0 per cent of drop-outs come from chronically poor families. They get below Rs. 3000/- per annum which is far below Rs. 5000/-, the computed cut off point of poverty line. The percentage of families who are chronically poor among drop-out families is lower in low drop-out areas than that in High Drop-out areas. Differences in Mean Income between Low and High Drop-out areas are significant only in the case of Industrial Belts.

Policy imperatives : Attempts to reduce wastage in education will not meet with success unless the problem is looked at with an integral perspective of rural life. The family background of drop-out children and mainly the incidence of chronic poverty is an essential dimension of this integral perspective. For educational efforts in retention of children to succeed it should be complemented with parallel and integral efforts in economic and social dimensions of life. Illustrations of such efforts in the light of occupation, income data of parents of drop-outs or introduction or strengthening of employment generation programmes, regulation of rural agricultural wages, intensive dry land cultivation, higher support price for agricultural produce and a differential support price in favour of marginal farmers, marketing and storage facilities, strengthening and extension of public distribution. In other words, there is a need to raise the levels of living, levels of welfare of people in rural areas. The measures suggested should be complementary to the efforts of the school in enrolling and retaining children.

Social Background

Though the percentage differences are negligible, still it is observed that except among the Muslims in all other communities a slightly lower percentage of drop-outs are there in the sample against the proportion of rural population of these religious communities in the population composition of the State. However, among the Hindus, (88.68 per cent in the sample are Hindu drop-out children). The drop-outs are composed of 33.0 per cent of Scheduled Caste and the rest non-Scheduled Castes. The proportion of Scheduled Castes among the rural Hindu population is 14.4 per cent. As such the Scheduled Castes contribute in larger proportions to drop-out phenomenon than their representation in the total population of the State. A higher proportion of drop-outs are Scheduled Castes in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas in Wet regions and Industrial Belts of the State. Even children from a significant section of Agricultural Caste constitute the drop-out sample.

Policy Imperatives

Efforts to check drop-out phenomenon needs to be focussed on the Scheduled Caste among the Hindus and the Muslims. The distribution of both these groups in rural areas of the State is not balanced one. There are some areas where there is a concentration of these groups (for instance in talukas like Humnabad, Bangarpet and Bhatkal, Muslim population are quite high, similarly in talukas like Honnavar the Scheduled Caste population is low and in some other areas they are not a significant group). Special efforts should focus on those areas where there is a concentration of these groups in the total population.

As of now there are a number of schemes for Scheduled castes ; but not for Muslims. Care should be taken to see that the Medium of Instruction would suit the mother-tongue (for instance Urdu as medium of instructions for Muslims) of the children attending from Muslim families provided they form a significant group. It may be advantageous to post teachers of the same sect or community in the schools functioning in these areas.

The Drop-out's World

'How does the drop-out spend his time as he does not attend school ?' This was an interesting question to which the study was addressed to and quite an amount of interesting and informative data have been collected in this regard. Drop-outs from schools are either engaged in domestic work which is not paid but all the while valuable as without it the parents may not be able to go for work or engaged in paid agricultural or non-agricultural work. Those drop-outs who do neither of this are negligible.

Duties of the Drop-outs Inside the Home

Drop-outs are serviceable at home in several ways. Their activities inside the home include supplying water to the home from the nearest water source, looking after younger children, assisting the mother in cooking, cleaning the house, cleaning the household utensils and washing the clothes. It is discovered that carrying water to home is a major activity as highest number of drop-outs are engaged in this activity in the State.

It is also observed that higher number of girls than boys are serviceable in all kinds of home management activities than boys and especially in cooking, cleaning the vessels and house and washing clothes.

Further, a higher percentage of drop-outs in general are serviceable at home in High Drop-out areas than in Low

Drop-out areas. And even here a higher percentage of girls are engaged in these kinds of activities than boys.

The Industrial Belt has the highest number of drop-outs engaged in the above activities and the hilly area has the lowest percentage. On an average 37.8 per cent of drop-outs are engaged in these activities in the State. Even here the girls far out-number the boys in terms of participation in these activities. The highest percentage of girls are engaged in the Industrial Belt. Significant differences between boys and girls are observed in all the regions, excepting the hilly and coastal in participation of these activities. Further, 'carrying water' is a significant activity in the Dry, Wet and Industrial Belt region.

Duties of the Drop-outs Outside the Home

Drop-outs are also engaged in a number of activities outside the home like looking after cattle/pigs/poultry, collecting cowdung/firewood, shopping, assisting father/mother in their out-of-home work. Of these 'the care of cattle/pigs/poultry' stand out as the highest number of drop-outs are engaged in this work. A higher percentage of drop-outs are engaged in this work in Low Drop-out area than in High Drop-out area.

On an average 33.0 per cent of drop-outs are serviceable in out-of-home activities in the State. No significant sex variation is observed in these activities. The highest number of drop-outs in dry regions and lowest in Hilly regions are engaged in these activities.

Time of Duties

Drop-outs work is spread out during the whole day as a large percentage of them in the State work during morning, afternoon and evening. Highest percentage of them are engaged in morning times than the other times of the day.

Also a higher percentage of girls work during all the three times than boys in the State and in Low and High Drop-out areas. Girls are busier in the morning than the other times.

In the Dry and Wet regions, a slightly higher percentage of drop-outs are engaged during evening times than during other periods and more boys than girls are engaged.

Duration Of Works

Majority of drop-outs in the State work between five to eight hours a day and this is true more for girls than for boys. The percentage of drop-outs who work either for more than eight hours or only for one or two hours a day is negligible.

Drop-outs in Paid Agricultural Work

On the whole 20.1 per cent of the sample of drop-outs are engaged in paid work. They are comprised of 14.5 per cent engaged in paid agricultural work, and 5.6 per cent in non-agricultural work. A higher percentage of boys than girls are engaged in non-agricultural work in the State as well as in all regions of the State.

The highest percentage of drop-outs engaged in paid agricultural labour are in hilly areas.

Frequency of Employment in Paid Agricultural Work

The highest (53.1) per cent of drop-outs engaged in paid agricultural work in the State get only 'occasional' and not 'regular' or 'frequent' employment. This is true of Low and High Drop-out areas also.

Highest percentage of girls than boys get 'frequent' or even 'regular' employment in Low Drop-out areas unlike High Drop-out areas where it is *vice versa*.

Drop-outs in Paid Non-agricultural Work

5.6 per cent of drop-outs are engaged in paid non-agricultural work. Even here a higher percentage of boys than girls are engaged in this work in the State as well as in Low and High Drop-out areas of the State. A higher percentage of drop-outs are engaged in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas.

Further, 50.0 per cent of both boys and girls engaged in paid non-agricultural work are found in coastal regions and mostly in High Drop-out area of these regions.

Even here, most of these drop-outs have to work all through the day though work is treated mostly as part-time. Further, for majority of the drop-outs, the work is spread out for five to eight hours a day.

Income of the Drop-out

The income of two-thirds of the drop-outs in paid-agricultural work does not go beyond Rs. 300/- per annum. The percentage is higher in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas of the State. A slightly higher percentage of Drop-outs get more than Rs. 300/- per annum in Low Drop-out areas. The mean annual income of the drop-out in paid agricultural work in the State is Rs. 245/-.

Majority of the drop-outs in all the regions excepting Hilly region get an annual income of less than Rs. 300/- in paid agricultural work. Further, the Mean Annual Income of these drop-outs is highest in Hilly region and lowest in the Dry region. Only in the Industrial Belt we do find a higher Mean Income than Median Income suggesting a positively skewed distribution, unlike the other regions where it is negatively skewed.

Payment in non-agricultural work appears better than that of agricultural work. About 59.0 per cent of drop-outs get more than Rs. 25/- per month. And the payment is better in High Drop-out areas than in Low Drop-out areas.

The mean monthly income of the drop-outs in paid non-agricultural work is Rs. 53.0/- and the High Drop-out areas have a slightly higher income than the Low Drop-out areas. Further, the drop-outs in the Coastal region get a mean monthly income of Rs. 57/- which is highest among all regions.

Sex Variations

Though, majority of boys and girls get less than Rs. 300/- p.a. in agricultural and Rs. 50/- p.m. in non-agricultural work, in general girls get a lower income than boys. This is true in Low and High Drop-out areas of the State and in the State as a whole.

Where does the drop-out's Income go ?

By and large the income of the drop-outs whether in agricultural or non-agricultural work is spent on family maintenance. In four each of eight out of ten talukas from Low and High Drop-out areas the income is spent exclusively on family maintenance. In the other two talukas it is mostly family maintenance.

A great majority of parents have reported that the drop-out's earning is very essential to the maintenance of the family. A higher percentage of parents of drop-outs in paid non-agricultural work than those of paid agricultural work have reported that the drop-out's earnings are additional and not essential income for the family. Further, in High Drop-out areas the child's earning is not so essential as in Low Drop-out areas.

Child labour and drop-out Phenomenon

Data of the study indicate that a higher incidence of child labour is associated with High Drop-out phenomenon. There are 22.0 per cent paid agricultural, non-agricultural labourers among drop-outs in High Drop-outs area of the State. The figure for Low Drop-out area is 17.8 per cent.

It is observed that the life style of drop-out in rural areas follows a pattern which is not affected by regional or low-high variations. If 44 out of every 100 drop-outs in High Drop-out areas are engaged in household duties, there are 33 such out of 100 drop-outs in the Low Drop-out areas. Majority of children in both Low (43.6%) and High (65.8 per cent) drop-out areas carry water to the home from the village tank or well.

Policy Imperatives

Water is essential for every home to wash clothes, cook food, toilet requirements and mainly drinking. Children ordinarily spend three to four hours a day in carrying water. This is a major household activity. This is perhaps one of the reasons for their inability to attend school. This fact is quite revealing for future exercise of educational planning. It is to be underlined that piece-meal, isolated and uni-directional efforts by educators to reduce wastage in education would be futile. What is required is an integrated, overall, multi-dimensional and inter-departmental effort to solve problems of education. Provision of safe and continuous water at the door-point of every household in rural areas is seen as quite essential not only for health care but also for the success of educational programmes. The time spent on carrying water will thus be reduced to the minimum and children will have time to attend to school.

An arrangement may be made in villages where water is available at a distance to supply water to the village. In such villages an unemployed semi-literate youth can be provided with water drums and a cart driven by an oxen or by hand on which he can bring water and supply water to the villagers so as to facilitate them to send their children to school. Such a person can be paid a remuneration commensurate with his job by the Government through the panchayats. A nominal charge can be levied on those who can afford to pay and the SC's, ST's and other weaker sections can be exempted from such payment.

It is not to suggest that drop-out phenomenon will be definitely reduced by this policy measure. This should be treated on par with other incentives and policy measures to reduce drop-out phenomenon such as those of Attendance scholarship, Mid-day meals and free supply of text books etc. As in the other cases it is hoped that a reduced pressure on children's time will enable them to participate in school. This measure should be a basis for motivating parents to send their children to schools.

There are 5.75 lakh villages in India and according to a survey conducted in 71-72 there were 1.52 lakh villages in India which face problems with respect to availability of clean drinking water. The problems were of three types : Non-availability of assured source of drinking water within a reasonable distance (taken as 1.6 kilometrs); the percentage of such villages was nearly sixty; source of water supply being susceptible to water borne diseases and source being affected by salinity or excessive flouride content. By 1978 April, 94978 villages were still uncovered out of 71-72 survey list. Subsequently many more villages were identified as problem villages. According to latest reports there are between 2.3 to 2.5 lakh villages in India which have problem regarding availability of safe drinking water. In other words, more than 40 per cent of villages in India have problem regarding availability of safe drinking water. In most cases even if it is available, the villagers have to walk on an average a distance of 1.6 km (For details about plans of coverage of villages under 'Rural Water Supply' scheme, refer to Draft Sixth Five-Year Plan 1978-83-Revised, Planning Commission, Government of India, p. 183). It may also be noted that rural water supply scheme is one among the nine minimim needs programmes along with the scheme for provision of compulsory primary education for the age-group 6 to 14 years. As such an integrated approach is necessary for the minimum needs programme.

Not all children withdrawn from school are sent for paid work by their parents. Only one out of five drop-outs is engaged in paid work, be it agricultural or non-agricultural. As such the relation between child labour and drop-out behaviour should be quite low. Taking those drop-outs who are engaged in domestic work as well as those who are employed as a single category it is observed that the drop-out children are relatively free during evening times. This is especially true of the Low Drop-out areas. The types of agricultural work that they mostly do is to engage in cotton picking, groundnut husking, coffee estate duties and such other less energy consuming jobs. Taking note of time and nature of duties, the possibility of organising non-formal education programmes during evening times may be quite meaningful. The adults (parents) may be advised about planned involvement of children in household duties or paid labour in relation to attendance at non-normal education centres. Non-normal education should provide for multiple entry system and ungraded curriculum. The curriculum may be graded in terms of difficulty value such as, that of the Minimum Learning continuam of the NCERT. But let it not be graded in terms of standards and promotions. It may be necessary and advantageous to enlist the co-operation of those farmers in the village (or other employers) who employ children and get them to insist on the attendance of children in non-formal schools. The best thing is to tag the employment opportunity with attendance at non-formal centres.

Involvement of local or community leaders in this regard would be profitable. However, non-formal education may not be a comprehensive solution for drop-out phenomenon at least in the near future. It is observed that-drop-out children are free relatively during evening times and power/electricity is required to organise evening schools for drop-out children in rural areas. But hardly 37.5 per cent of the villages in the country are electrified. Karnataka State is a little better in having 66.0 per cent of electrified villages. There are many States which do not have even one fifth of their villages electrified. In such places it may be advantageous to organise non-formal education in the afternoons as drop-out children are observed to be busy during morning times and motivate parents to send their drop-out children to non-formal schools. It may also be necessary to step up programmes of rural electrification. It should also be possible for the government to provide for work after or before school hours to children. The work may be husking of groundnut, making agarabathi or beedi-rolling, or such other work which may be decided looking in to the ecological, administrative and other aspects. This can be done only if there is inter-departmental co-operation, between the department of education on the one hand and that of agriculture, horticulture, small scale or home industries, etc. This may be a sort of work experience for children. It can also be treated as a 'earn while you learn' scheme. This will be quite essential as those drop-outs who are in paid work are so engaged because their earning is quite essential for the parents for management of household needs. This is very true of drop-out families in the high drop-out area. Further, a great majority of drop-out families are far below the poverty line. Arranging 'learn while you earn' schemes in programmes of formal and non-formal education presupposes a great deal of willingness on the part of the government not only to ensure cent per cent enrolment and attendance of children and thereby remove illiteracy but also to fight poverty and suffering in rural areas and thereby to uplift the masses of humanity from freedom of want. Problems of administration, organisation and managment that may be forwarded as arguments against 'earn and learn' schemes will only be excuses for inaction and pretentions for covering up an unwilling attitude. The 'will to do' can overcome all such problems.

Dowry and Drop-outs

It may be observed that in case of 13.6 per cent of parents of girls drop-outs in the State, most of them living in the two High Drop-out areas of Dry and Wet regions, the prospect of a higher marriage expenditure inclusive of Dowry has weighed much in withdrawing their daughters from school. Nearly two out of every three girl drop-outs in High Drop-out areas of Dry and Wet regions are withdrawn from school for consideration of Dowry.

Policy Imperatives

The facts suggest the vigorous and sustained anti-Dowry campaign in rural areas. Such campaigns can be taken up by voluntary organisations working in rural areas. The Government can encourage the voluntary organisation in this work through financial and other incentives. A part of the marriage expenses of girls belonging to Scheduled Castes and other chronically poor families can be met by the Government provided they successfully complete a course of primary education.

Drop-outs and their ex-teachers

Nearly 20.0 per cent (one out of every five) teachers in rural areas beat children as reported by the parents of drop-out children. Further, 8.2 per cent or one out of twelve parents reported that they had withdrawn their children. This was advanced as an additional reason for withdrawal of children.

Policy Imperatives

The administrative and inspecting machinery should discourage teachers from beating children.

SECTION B

Drop-out phenomenon is analysed in this study in the framework of school factors also. The analysis of data is done mostly in terms of comparison of school factors between Low and High drop-out areas and among regions. The major variables covered are teacher, school plant, school euipment, incentive schemes, co-curricular activities and community participation.

Profile of Schools Covered

In the present study 62 villages have been covered from five Low Drop-out as well as from five High Drop-out areas. From these 62 villages, 80 primary schools are covered out of which 46 schools are Lower Primary Schools with I to IV standards and the rest are Higher or Model Primary Schools with I to VII standard.

It is observed that 75.0 per cent of the Lower Primary Schools covered in the study are single teacher schools and their percentage works out to be 42.5 per cent when all Lower Primary and Higher Primary Schools covered in the study are considered together.

While the highest percentage of Single Teacher Schools are found in Coastal region, the Hilly Low Drop-out area (Mercara) does not even have a single teacher primary schools.

The percentage of single teacher schools in Low Drop-out areas is 62.0 while that for the High Drop-out areas is 84.0. The difference of 22.0 per cent was subject to 't' test analysis. A 't' value of 3.33 was obtained. This is significant at 0.01 level. As such the proportion of single teacher schools in an area may influence the drop- out phenomenon.

School factors in drop-out phenomenon– The Teacher

It is observed that the Teacher-Pupil ratio is slightly lower in primary schools of lower drop-out areas than it is in primary schools of High Drop-out areas. While the teacher, pupil ratio is 1:41 in Low Drop-out area, it is 1:48 in High Drop-out areas.

There is no difference in teacher-pupil ratio of single teacher schools in Low and High Drop-out areas. But, the teacher-pupil ratio is found to be slightly higher in the case of Multi-teacher, Lower Primary Schools of High Drop-cut areas than that of Low Drop-out areas.

Further, the teacher-pupil ratio in Higher Primary Schools of Low Drop-out area is also better than that of High Drop-out areas.

69.0 per cent of the schools in the present study have no famale teachers.

Low Drop-out Hilly areas (Mercara) where drop-out rate the initial stage of schooling is quite low as compared to other areas and regions has no school with exclusively men teacher.

50.0 per cent of the teachers in the State do not stay in the village where they serve. The percentage of teachers commuting from outside is highest in Industrial Belts.

There is no school covered in the present study which is maintained exclusively by untrained teachers. Further, 24.0 per cent of schools in general have some untrained teachers, who are usually the stipendary graduates.

The study has revealed that schools in low drop-out area have a higher proportion of young and relatively less experienced teachers than the High Drop-out areas.

The School Plant

Majority of the villages in the study are located far away from the main road. The Low Drop-out areas score over the High Drop-out areas in this regard. Majority of villages in all areas and regions except the low areas of wet regions do not have pucca road to the village.

Though majority of the village in the study are located far away from the main road, 60.0 per cent have schools within the village itself. Only 12.5 per cent of the villages have schools located far away from them.

Majority of schools covered in the study have a pucca building. There are also some schools in the State though a few and negligible which have thatched rooves. The position of Low and High Drop-out areas with respect to school plant is almost the same.

School Size

45.0 per cent of the schools in the State are run in a single class room. And another 40.0 per cent, though have more than one room do not have one room for each class. Hardly 13.75 per cent of the schools have one room for each standard of primary education.

The Low Drop-out areas fare better than the High Drop-out areas with respect to size of school building.

45.0 per cent of the schools in the State do not have drinking water facility for children in the school, and majority of them are in High Drop-out areas.

95.0 per cent of schools do not have urinal or toilet facility

School Equipment

Black Board : Majority of schools (64.0 per cent) in the State do not have at least one Blackboard per standard of Primary education. This is true of all regions in the State.

The position of Higher Primary Schools in LDA with respect to Blackboards facility appears to be better than that in HDA. But still more than one third of primary schools in the State do not have one Blackboard for each standard of primary education.

It is observed that in Lower Primary Schools of Low Drop-out area two-third of children have seating facility while only 50.0 per cent of children have the same facility in the High Drop out areas.

In case of Higher Primary Schools, 80.0 per cent of children have seating facility in terms of Benches, Desks or Planks in the Low Drop-out area. But, in High Drop-out area, only 25.0 per cent have this facility.

With respect to furniture for staff, it is observed that LDA fares better than HDA.

It is observed that the 'Map of India' is essential to a Lower Primary School is found only in 6 schools of LDA (out of 21 schools) and 14 schools of HDA (out of 25 schools). Further, the 'Map of Karnataka' is found in only two schools of Low Drop-out area and no school in HDA has this Map.

The position of Higher Primary Schools with respect to Maps appears to be better than that of Lower Primary Schools. There is no HPS either in LDA or HDA which does not have a Map of Karnataka or Map of India.

It is observed that on an average Lower Primary Schools in the LDA and HDA have thirteen charts per school. A higher percentage of schools in High Drop-out area fall below the average than those in Low Drop-out area.

While most of the schools have alphabetical and story telling charts, majority of them both in LDA and HDA do not have flower charts, Bird charts and charts of social studies, Health and Hygiene, time and seasons. In addition majority of schools in HDA do not have number Charts, Animal Charts, and charts required for teaching Life Sciences and Mathematics.

All higher Primary Schools in the State possess charts and majority of them have charts for alphabets, Life Sciences, Mathematics, Story Telling, Health and Hygiene. But majority of schools in LDA do not have flower charts and charts useful for teaching Civics.

Majority of Lower Primary Schools have photos or pictures of National Leaders. There are only three schools in LDA and nine schools in HDA which do not have any such pictures.

Teaching Aids

Majority of LPS in both LDA and HDA do not have teaching aids. The average number of teaching aids in LPS of LDA is better than that of HDA.

Higher Primary Schools fair better than LPS with respect to possession of teaching aids.

Facilities for Physical Education

Play ground Facility : It is observed that 8 schools out of 21 LPS and 11 out of 17 HPS in LDA have play ground facility ; while 11 out of 25 LPS and 7 out of 17 HPS in

HDA have playground facility. Though many of the schools do not have playground, they have facilities for physical education.

Play Equipment

Majority of Lower Primary Schools conduct physical education. And all the Higher Primary Schools have facilities for physical education. Only one school in HDA has all physical education material. Further, the schools in LDA are better off than those in HDA with respect to possession of these materials.

Facilities for sports and games

Majority of the primary schools in the State (59.0%) do not have facilities for either indoor or outdoor sports and games. An equal number of HPS in Low and High Drop-out areas have facilities for both indoor and outdoor sports and games.

Co-curricular Activities

A great majority of schools in the State conduct co-curricular activities.

Library Books

The LPS in LDA have 131 library books on an average. While the LPS in HDA have 115 books on an avarage. But, majority of schools both in LDA and HDA fall below the average.

A great majority of LPS do not have either wall clock or time piece. The percentage of such schools is slightly high in High Drop-out areas.

Incentive Schemes

Data obtained in the study indicate that the HDA fair better than the LDA with respect to the number of schemes in force in both LPS and HPS except with respect to free supply of text-books and scholarship for ex-servicemen at the LPS.

When the primary schools are considered in general, a high percentage of schools have mid-day meals and free supply of text-books schemes.

44.0 per cent of Higher Primary Schools have pre-matric scholarship scheme. As such none of the various Incentive Schemes is implemented in a large majority of the schools.

Community Participation

Most of the schools organise periodically the SBC meetings. Majority of schools organise 3-4 meetings in year in both LDA and HDA. There are by and large 6-7 members in all these SBC's. More than 70% of the members attend the SBC meetings regularly.

The SBC's in HDA fair as well as those in LDA in terms of contribution either in cash or in kind. But on a crude average, it is observed that cash contributions by SBC's is in LDA is slightly higher than that in HDA.

Policy Imperatives

The policy imperatives suggested in this section are those based on findings of the study of school variables in relation to drop-out phenomenon. No suggestion has been given which is not rooted in empirical data. All the findings have been presented together and the policy imperatives are also pooled up here. They are presented as far as possible in order of their importance. However, errors about ordering of suggestions are not ruled out. The suggestions given should be treated as a package rather than piece-meal solutions.

Teacher Supply

Single teacher schools are the bane of Primary Education in this country. This study also has shown that the High Drop-out areas which have registered a higher drop-out rate have a higher percentage of single-teacher schools than those in Low Drop-out areas. The difference is significant as observed through 't' test analysis. As such a Clarion call is hereby given to progressively reduce the number of Single Teacher Schools in the State. As of now there is 55.3 per cent of Single Teacher Schools in the State. This figure is out of 35143 of primary schools. 55.3 per cent means roughly 19, 455 Single-Teacher Schools. Figures are collected in person from Department of Public Instruction, Government of Karnataka, 1981. This should be treated as a backlog and permission henceforth should not be given to open Single Teacher Schools. As a modest effort to clear the backlog of Single-Teacher Schools at least one more teacher should be provided for each of the existing Single-Teacher Schools This can be done in a phased manner over a period of ten years if 2000 additional primary school teachers can be appointed every year for a period of ten years. The figures works out to be 100 teachers on an average for each district as there are 20 district in the State. However, the bigger districts and those with higher backlog should be given a proportionate number of additional teachers. Data of this study have also shown in general that the teacher-pupil ratio is lower in Low Drop-out areas as compared to High Drop-out areas. This fact further strengthens the case for discontinuance of Single-Teacher-School system. The suggestion made here should not be dismissed as 'ambitious' so as to cover up a lack of commitment to solve the problem of wastage in efforts at Universalization of Primary Education.

It is also desirable to appoint a female teacher in primary schools. It is observed that drop-out rates are high in schools with 'all Male' teachers. Further, it may be advantageous to post relatively young teachers in areas registering High Drop-out rates.

School Size : 45.0 per cent of schools in the State are run in single class rooms. Another 40.0 per cent, though have more than one room do not have one room for each standard of primary education. The Low Drop-out areas fair better than High Drop-out areas with respect to school size. As such it is essential to first concentrate on those schools which are run in single rooms. At least one more room should be provided for those schools which are run in only one room. This suggestion should be treated along with the plea made earlier for provision of one more teacher for single teacher schools. At least two class rooms for Lower Primary Schools, one for standards I and II and the other for Standards III and IV and five rooms for Higher Primary Schools—one for standards I and II, one for standards III & IV and one for standards V, VI and VII is to be treated as an optimum if not an ideal condition for a fair deal to children attending primary schools.

School equipment : It is said commentary on the state of primary education in the State that 64.0 per cent of schools do not have one Black-board per standard of primary education. The High Drop-out areas are worse off than Low Drop-out areas in this respect. Provision of additional Black-boards to schools is an immediate and urgent necessity. Though the Lower Primary Schools to some extent and Higher Primary Schools to a large extent in Low Drop-out areas fair very much better than the schools in High Drop-out areas with respect to seating facility for children, the provision of benches, desks or planks may be treated as important next in order to provision of Black-boards. Again, the Low Drop-out areas with better furniture for staff in its schools than those in High Drop-out-areas suggest provision of furniture for staff.

The position of LPS in particular and primary schools in general with respect to possession of maps and charts is disappointing. It is sad that most of the LPS do not have a Map of India and it is further sad that almost all the schools do not have a Map of Karnataka. Most of the students leave school without being aware of the position of their existence in relation to time and space. Many schools do not have flower charts, bird charts and charts of health hygiena and social studies, not to speak of time and season charts and charts required for teaching Life Sciences and Mathematics.

The position of Primary Schools with respect to possession of Black-boards, charts, maps and teaching aids warrants a normative framework for functioning of primary schools. It is essential to set up norms for starting or running the existing primary schools and rigorously enforcing the observation of such norms. Vigilance in this regard should be an essential input for school management and inspection. Then only can primary education be mounted on a sound footing and given a proper status which it has been deprived of all these years.

Another interesting feature observed in primary schools with respect to posession of charts, teaching aids, play equipment, library books, etc. is the imbalance in distribution of facilities. For instance, though on an average the LPS in LDA have 131 library books (which is itself a low figure) and the HDA have 115 books still it is observed that majority of schools both in LDA and HDA fall below the average. Such imbalances need to be off set through formulation of district plans for educational development.

Distance of the school

The study emphasizes the need to build pucca roads to the school from the village. Majority of the villages in the study are located far away from the main road and the schools in a few of these villages are also far off. Such villages have to be identified and listed. Road construction work for these villages can be taken up in collaboration with the Public Works Department. However, in the meantime a project for free supply of cheap and durable foot-wear may be launced. Those children who do not have good roads to the school from their place of residence and also have to walk a long distance may be covered under this scheme so as to encourage their regular attendance in school and consequently their retention.

A scheme of free supply of rain-proof bags and plastic caps may be provided for children in coastal and Malnad areas. In the beginning only Higher Primary Schools may be covered as children are observed to walk long distances to attend Higher Primary Schools in these areas.

Epilogue

The problems and quality of education in a society cannot be very different from the problems and quality of life therein. Rather the former is very much dependent upon the latter. It is very difficult to raise the status of school education above the level of life around. As of now in Indian society masses of people are poor, ignorant and disorganised. They live amidst several uncertainties of life such as failures of monsoon leading to draught and famine, periodical floods, cyclones, etc; created by nature. Added to these uncertainties they are also affected by man-made pressures, the dynamics of which they are not aware of, such as exploitation of the large masses by the few well-to-do, under-employment, blocks for mobilization, price rise and inflation etc. It is too much to expect these people to be orderly in life and conscious of their interests in the context of school education. These observations should not in anyway undermine the importance of school education as an instrument of development and progress. Rather it should be looked at as a pointer to the need to improve the levels of life and levels of welfare of people in general, and schooling in particular.

Table 2 : Master Tables of Drop-out Phenomenon in the State (Showing regional, high-low, sex and standard-wise variations)

		I			*II*			*III*			*IV*		
		B	*G*	*T*	*B*	*G*	*T*	*B*	*G*	*T*	*B*	*G*	*T*
Dry	L	25	32	57	31	42	73	19	33	52	29	34	63
	H	85	72	157	30	13	43	12	1	13	9	7	16
	T	110	104	214	61	55	116	31	34	65	38	41	79
				(45.14)			(24.5)			(13.7)			(16.7)
Wet	L	45	60	105	20	19	39	24	9	33	25	13	38
	H	29	38	67	44	24	68	16	4	20	9	7	16
	T	74	98	172	64	43	107	40	13	53	34	20	54
				(41. 6)			(25.9)			(12.8)			(13.1)
Coastal	L	69	45	114	33	19	52	8	6	14	6	3	9
	H	38	57	95	46	35	81	22	16	38	18	7	25
	T	107	102	209	79	54	133	30	22	52	24	10	34
				(47. 1)			(30.0)			(11.7)			(7.6)
Hilly	L	12	4	16	3	3	6	8	3	11	7	4	11
	H	32	38	70	19	16	35	17	5	22	9	5	14
	T	44	42	86	22	19	41	25	8	33	16	9	25
				(35. 9)			(17.2)			(13.8)			(10.5)
I B	L	23	42	65	11	29	40	9	12	21	9	5	14
	H	22	44	66	12	18	30	3	6	9	4	6	10
	T	45	86	131	23	47	70	12	18	30	13	11	24
				(46.1)			(24.3)			(10.4)			(8.3)
Total		380	432	812	249	218	467	138	95	233	125	91	216

Table 2: (Contd.)

		V			*VI*			*VII*			*Total*		
		B	*G*	*T*	*B*	*G*	*T*	*B*	*G*	*T*	*B*	*G*	*T*
Dry	L	5	1	6	2	0	2	0	0	0	111	142	253
	H	4	1	5	3	2	5	2	0	2	145	96	241
	T	9	2	11	5	2	7	2	0	2	256	238	494
				(2.2)			(1.4)			(0.4)			
Wet	L	6	3	9	8	0	8	1	5	6	129	109	238
	H	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	100	75	175
	T	7	4	11	9	0	9	1	6	7	229	184	413
				(2.7)			(2.1)			(1.6)			
Coastal	L	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	74	193
	H	2	3	5	1	1	2	4	1	5	131	120	251
	T	5	4	9	1	1	2	4	1	5	250	194	444
				(2.0)			(0.4)			(1.1)			
Hilly	L	12	10	22	13	10	23	1	1	2	56	35	91
	H	2	1	3	0	1	1	2	1	3	81	67	148
	T	14	11	25	13	11	24	3	2	5	137	102	239
				(10.5)			(10.8)			(2.1)			
I B	L	7	2	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	60	90	150
	H	4	7	11	5	4	9	1	2	3	51	87	138
	T	11	9	20	6	4	10	1	2	3	111	177	288
				(6.9)			(3.4)			(1.0)			
Total		46	30	76	34	18	52	11	11	22	983	895	1878

Table 3 : Standard-wise Drop-outs in different regions of the State

Region *Standard*	*Dry*	*Wet*	*Coastal*	*Hilly*	*I B*
I	43.3	41.6	47.1	35.9	46.1
II	24.5	25.9	30.0	17.2	24.3
Total	67.8	67.5	77.1	53.1	70.4
III and IV	29.1	25.9	19.3	24.5	18.7
Total LPS	96.9	93.4	96.4	77.6	89.1
Total HPS	3.1	6.6	3.6	22.4	10.9

Table 4 : Standard-wise Drop-outs in Low and High Drop-out Areas

Area *Standard*	*Low Drop-out Area*	*High Drop-out Area*
I	38.5	47.7
II	22.6	27.0
Total	61.1	74.7
III & IV	28.7	19.2
Total LPS	89.8	93.9
Total HPS	10.2	6.1

Table 5 : Sex-variations in standard-wise drop-out in different regions of the State

Region *Standard*	*Dry* *Boys*	*Girls*	*Wet* *Boys*	*Girls*	*Coastal* *Boys*	*Girls*	*Hilly* *Boys*	*Girls*	*I B* *Boys*	*Girls*
I	43.0	43.7	32.3	53.2	42.8	52.5	32.1	41.1	40.5	48.5
II	23.8	23.1	27.9	23.3	31.6	27.8	16.0	18.6	20.7	26.5
Total	66.8	66.8	60.2	76.5	74.4	80.3	48.1	59.7	61.2	75.0
III & IV	26.9	31.5	32.2	17.9	21.6	16.5	29.9	16.6	22.5	16.3
L P S	93.7	98.3	92.4	94.4	96.0	96.8	78.0	76.3	83.7	91.3
H P S	6.3	1.7	7.6	5.6	4.0	3.2	22.0	24.0	16.3	8.7

Table 6 : Standard-wise Sex-Variations in High and Low Drop-out Areas

Area *Standard*	*Low*		*High*	
	Boys	*Girls*	*Boys*	*Girls*
I	36.6	40.6	40.5	55.9
II	20.6	24.8	30.0	23.8
Total	57.2	65.4	70.5	79.7
III & IV	30.3	27.1	23.4	12.5
Total LPS	87.5	92.5	93.9	92.2
Total HPS	12.5	7.5	6.1	7.8

Table 8 : Region-wise Percentage of Drop-outs in High-Low Drop-out Areas Who Did Not Learn Anything at School and Who Dropped Out at I and II Standards

Area *Region*	*High Drop-out Area*	*Low Drop-out Area*	*Total*
Dry	72%	47%	60%
Wet	52%	40%	46%
Coastal	64%	62%	63%
Hilly	38%	18%	28%
I B	46%	52%	49%
State Total	54.4%	43.8%	49.2%

Table 9 : Education of Fathers of Drop-outs Showing Regional and Low-High Variations

Level of Education	*Dry*		*Wet*		*Coastal*		*Hilly*		*I B*		*State*		*Total for State*
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	
Illiterates	150 (59.2)	165 (68.4)	165 (65.9)	124 (70.8)	127 (70.9)	184 (73,2)	39 (42.0)	101 (67.0)	78 (52.0)	92 (66.0)	569 (61.5)	666 (68.8)	
Total	315 (63.8)		289 (69.9)		321 (72.3)		140 (58.1)		170 (59.0)		1225 (65.2)		65.2
Able to read & write	60 (23.7)	34 (14.1)	28 (11.7)	25 (14.2)	51 (26.4)	51 (20.3)	18 (19.0)	21 (14.0)	51 (34.0)	22 (16.0)	208 (22.4)	153 (16.1)	
Total	94 (19 2)		53 (12.8)		102 (22.9)		39 (16.3)		73 (25.4)		361 (19.3)		19.3
Pry Edn.	22 (8.7)	29 (12.0)	26 (10.9)	24 (13.1)	5 (2.5)	5 (15.8)	28 (30.0)	16 (11.0)	14 (10.0)	13 (9.0)	95 (10.2)	86 (9.9)	
Total	51 (10.3)		50 (12.1)		10 (2.2)		44 (18.3)		27 (9.3)		181 (10.5)		10.5
Secondary Edn.	2 (0.8)	2 (0.8)	9 (3.7)	1 (0.6)			3 (3.0)	1 (1.0)	3 (2.0)	8 (6.0)	17 (1.8)	12 (1.3)	
Total	4 (0.8)		10 (2.4)				4 (1.6)		11 (3.8)		29 (1.6)		1.6

Higher Edn.	1 (0.4)											
Total	1 (0.2)											
No response	18 (7.1)	11 (4.5)	10 (4.1)	1 (0.5)		12 (4.7)	13 (3.2)	9 (6.1)	4 (2.6)	3 (2.7)	35	35
Total	29 (5.8)		11 (2.6)		12 (2.7)		22 (5.0)		7 (2.4)		70 (3.7)	
Total for Low & High Area	253	241	238	178	193	251	91	148	150	138	492	508

Table 10 : **Education of Mothers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise Variation**

Level of Education	*Dry*	*Wet*	*Coastal*	*Hilly*	*I B*	*Total*
Illiterates	476 (96.3)	394 (95.3)	425 (95.7)	203 (84.9)	271 (94.1)	1769 (93.3)
Able to read & write	2 (0.4)	6 (1.4)	1 (0.2)	15 (6.2)	6 (2.1)	30 (2.1)
Primary Education	4 (0.8)	4 (0.9)	— —	9 (3.7)	2 (0.7)	19 (1.2)
Secondary Education	—	1 (0.2)	— —	1 (0.4)	1 (0.3)	3 (0.2)
Higher Education	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	12 (2.4)	8 (1.9)	18 (4.1)	11 (4.1)	8 (2.7)	57 (3.5)
Total	494	413	444	239	288	1878

Table 11 : Educational Attainment of Family Members

Level of Education	Dry		Wet		Coastal		Hilly		I B		State	
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
All elders to drop-out having no education	78 (31.0)	40 (16.0)	96 (40.3)	59 (33.7)	66 (34.3)	84 (49.0)	12 (13.1)	38 (26.0)	39 (26.0)	15 (10.8)	291 (31.5)	236 (26.8)
Total	118 (23.5)		155 (37.0)		150 (41.6)		50 (19.5)		54 (18.4)		527 (29.1)	
Some elders only having no education	0 (0)	58 (24.4)	09 (3.0)	12 (6.8)	0 (0)	8 (4.6)	0 (0)	8 (5.4)	0 (0)	6 (4.3)	9 (1.0)	92 (10.5)
Total	58 (12.3)		21 (5.3)		8 (2.3)		8 (2.7)		6 (2.2)		101 (5.8)	
All elders having education upto primary	11 (4.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1.1)	12 (6.2)	0 (0)	2 (2.1)	2 (1.4)	12 (8.0)	0 (0)	37 (4.0)	4 (0.4)
Total	11 (2.2)		2 (0.5)		12 (3.1)		4 (1.8)		12 (4.0)		41 (2.2)	
Some having education upto primary	58 (23.0)	25 (10.4)	40 (16.8)	39 (22.2)	52 (27.0)	43 (25.0)	28 (30.7)	39 (26.0)	27 (18.0)	11 (7.1)	205 (22.1)	157 (17.9)
Total	83 (16.7)		79 (19.5)		85 (26.0)		67 (28.3)		38 (12.6)		362 (20.0)	

Table 11 : (Contd.)

Level of Education	Dry		Wet		Coastal		Hilly		I B		State	
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
All above primary education	3 (11.2)	0	0	0	0	0	5 (5.5)	0	1 (0.6)	0	9 (1.0)	0
Total	3 (0.5)						5 (2.7)		1 (0.3)		9 (0.5)	
Some above primary education	40 (16.0)	60 (25.0)	27 (11.3)	28 (16.1)	3 (1.5)	32 (19.0)	21 (29.1)	22 (14.6)	10 (6.6)	42 (30.4)	101 (10.9)	184 (22.2)
Total	100 (20.5)		55 (13.7)		35 (10.2)		43 (18.9)		52 (18.5)		285 (16.6)	
Most of the elders of the drop-outs are illiterates	0 (0)	58 (24.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (9.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	58 (13.2)	3 (2.0)	8 (5.8)	21 (2.3)	71 (8.1)
Total	58 (12.3)		0 (0)		18 (4.7)		5 (1.6)		11 (3.9)		92 (5.2)	

Not applicable (drop-out is the only child or eldest)	62 (24.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	35 (20.0)	38 (19.8)	0 (0)	23 (25.2)	34 (22.6)	55 (36.6)	53 (38.4)	178 (19.8)	122 (13.9)
Total	62 (12.3)		35 (10.0)		38 (9.9)		57 (23.9)		108 (37.5)		300 (16.8)	
No response	1	0	66 (27.5)	0	4 (2.1)	6	0	0	3 (2.0)	3 (2.0)	74 (8.0)	9 (1.0)
Total	253	241	238	175	193	173	91	148	150	138	925	875

Note : The coastal total for high drop-out area is 251 ; figures are available only for 173 schedules.

Table 12 : Occupation of Fathers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations

Type of occupation	Dry		Wet		Coastal		Hilly		I B		State	
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Unskilled labour	1 (8.4)	56 (23.2)	4 (1.6)	11 (6.3)	4 (2.1)	14 (5.5)	2 (2.2)	33 (22.3)	9 (6.0)	1 (0.7)	20 (2.1)	115 (12.1)
Total	57 (11.8)		15 (3.9)		18 (3.8)		35 (12.3)		10 (3.3)		135 (7.2)	
Skilled labour	8 (3.2)	2 (0.2)	10 (4.1)	4 (2.3)	4 (2.1)	72 (28.6)	15 (16.4)	5 (3.4)	9 (6.0)	3 (2.1)	46 (4.6)	86 (9.0)
Total	10 (1.7)		14 (3.2)		76 (15.3)		20 (9.9)		12 (4.0)		132 (6.8)	
Retail business	5	9	5	--	2 (1.1)	3 (1.2)	3 (3.3)	1 (0.6)	17 (11.3)	1 (0.7)	32 (3.4)	14 (1.4)
Total	14 (2.8)		5 (1.5)		5 (1.1)		4 (1.9)		18 (6.0)		46 (2.4)	
Services	1 (0.4)	10 (4.1)	6 (2.5)	3 (1.7)	— —	3 (1.2)	1 (1.1)	2 (1.3)	3 (2.0)	9 (6.3)	11 (1.2)	27 (2.0)
Total	11 (2.2)		9 (2.1)		3 (0.6)		3 (1.2)		12 (4.1)		38 (2.0)	
Owning land	2 (0.7)	31 (12.8)	134 (56.3)	63 (36.0)	94 (48.6)	51 (20.3)	23 (25.2)	15 (10.1)	77 (51.3)	19 (13.9)	330 (35.6)	179 (18.7)
Total	33 (6.7)		197 (46.1)		145 (34.4)		38 (17.6)		96 (32.6)		509 (27.1)	

Contd. Table 12 :

Cultivating land	192 (75.8)	87 (36.1)	62 (26.5)	37 (21.1)	3 (1.5)	83 (33.1)	10 (10.9)	45 (30.4)	5 (3.3)	72 (52.1)	272 (29.3)	324 (34.3)
Total	279 (55.9)		99 (23.8)		86 (17.3)		55 (25.6)		77 (22.7)		596 (31.6)	
Agrl. Labour	23 (9.9)	38 (15.7)	15 (6.3)	56 (32.0)	80 (41.4)	9 (3.5)	24 (26.3)	35 (23.6)	29 (19.3)	28 (20.3)	171 (18.4)	166 (17.4)
Total	61 (12.8)		71 (19.1)		89 (22.5)		59 (24.9)		57 (19.8)		337 (17.9)	
Share cropping	7 (2.5)	—	—	1 (0.6)	3 (1.5)	—	—	—	—	—	10 (1.1)	1 (0.1)
Total	7 (1.3)		1 (0.3)		3 (0.7)						11 (0.6)	
Bonded labourer												
Total												
No response	14 (5.5)	8 (3 3)	2 (0.8)		2 (1.1)	8 (3.1)	6 (6.6)		1 (0.7)	5 (3.5)	25 (2.7)	21 (2.2)
Total	22 (4.4)		2 (0.4)		10 (2.1)		6 (3.3)		6 (2.1)		46 (2.4)	
Not applicable					1 (0.5)	8 (3.1)	7 (7.7)	12 (8.1)			8 (0.9)	20 (2.1)
Total					9 (1.8)		19 (8.4)				28 (1 5)	
Total	253	241	238	175	193	251	91	148	150	138	925	953

Table 13 : Statement Showing Regional Variations Between Low and High Drop-out Talukas With Respect to Nature of Occupation of Fathers of Drop-out Children

Nature of occupation	*Dry*		*Wet*		*Coastal*		*Hilly*		*I B*	
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
Agriculture based occupations pooled up entries under 5, 6, 7 and 8 in Table 12	88.9	68.6	89.1	89.7	93.0	56.9	62.4	64.1	73.9	86 3
Non-agriculture based occupations pooled up entries under 1, 2, 5 and 4 in table 12	5.9	31.2	10.3	10.3	5.3	36.5	23.1	27.6	25.7	9.8

Table 14 : **Occupations of Mothers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations**

Type of occupation	*Dry*		*Wet*		*Coastal*		*Hilly*		*I B*		*State*	
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
Unskilled labour	4 (1.5)	121 (50.2)	3 (1.2)		50 (25.9)	70 (27.8)	17 (18.6)	32 (21.6)	21 (14.0)	1 (0.7)	95 (10.3)	224 (23.5)
Total	125 (25.3)		3 (0.7)		120 (27.0)		49 (20.5)		22 (7.6)		319 (16.9)	
Skilled labour			3 (1.2)	1 (0.6)		1 (0.3)	2 (2.2)	—	1 (0.6)	1 (0.7)	6 (0.6)	3 (0.3)
Total			4 (0.9)		1		2 (0.8)		2 (0.6)		9 (0.4)	
Retail business			1 (0.4)	1 (0.6)	1 (0.5)						2 (0.2)	1 (0.1)
Total			2 (0.5)		1 (0 2)						3 (0.1)	
Services			5 (2.0)				9 (1.2)			2 (1.4)	5 (0.5)	5 (0.5)
Total			5 (1.2)		3 (0.7)				2 (0.6)		10 (0.5)	
Owning land												
Total												
Cultivating Land												
Total												

Contd Table 14 :

Type of occupation	Dry		Wet		Coastal		Hilly		I B		State	
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
Agrl. labour	142 (56.1)		116 (44.5)	63 (36.0)		66 (26.2)	18 (19.7)		4 (2.6)	97 (70.3)	280 (30.2)	226 (23.7)
Total	142 (28.7)		179 (43.3)		66 (12.8)		18 (7.5)		101 (35.1)		506 (26.9)	
Share cropping												
Total												
Bonded labour												
Total												
No response			10 (4.0)			8 (3.1)			1 (0.6)	6 (4.3)	11 (1.1)	14 (1.4)
Total			10 (2.4)		8 (1.8)				7 (2.4)		25 (1.2)	
Not applicable (Housewives)	107 (42.2)	120 (49.7)	100 (41.6)	110 (62.8)	142 (73.5)	103 (41.0)	54 (59.3)	116 (78.4)	123 (82.0)	31 (20.6)	526 (56.8)	480 (50.3)
Total	227 (50.0)		210 (50.8)		245 (55.1)		170 (71.1)		154 (51.3)		1006 (53 5)	
Grand Total	253	241	238	175	193	251	91	148	150	138	925	953

Table 15 : Size of Land Holding of Fathers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations

Type of farmer	*Dry*		*Wet*		*Coastal*		*Hilly*		*I B*		*State*	
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
Marginal farmer	42 (16.4)	57 (23.6)	92 (38.1)	39 (22.2)	94 (48.7)	141 (56.1)	36 (39.5)	36 (24.3)	44 (29.3)	61 (44.1)	308 (34.4)	334 (34.6)
Total	99 (20.1)		131 (31.7)		235 (52.9)		72 (30.1)		105 (36.7)		642 (34.5)	
Small farmer	45 (17.7)	38 (15.7)	66 (27.7)	36 (20.5)	9 (4.6)	6 (2.3)	10 (10.9)	25 (16.8)	28 (18.6)	36 (26.1)	158 (15.9)	141 (16.3)
Total	83 (16.8)		102 (24.6)		15 (3.3)		35 (14.6)		64 (22.3)		299 (16.1)	
Big farmer	122 (48.1)	88 (36.5)	35 (14.7)	49 (28.0)	4 (2.1)	4 (1.5)	6 (6.5)	16 (10.8)	19 (12.6)	11 (5.5)	186 (16.5)	168 (16.4)
Total	210 (42.5)		84 (20.3)		8 (1 8)		22 (9.2)		30 (9.1)		354 (16.2)	
Landless respondents	22 (8.7)	56 (23.2)	38 (15.9)	43 (24 5)	85 (44.0)	100 (39.8)	34 (37.3)	56 (38.0)	57 (38.0)	25 (15.7)	236 (28.7)	280 (28.2)
Total	78 (15.7)		81 (19.3)		185 (41.6)		90 (37.6)		82 (26.8)		516 (28.4)	
No response	22 (8.7)	2 (0.8)	7 (2.9)	5 (2.2)	1 (0.5)			3 (2.0)	2 (1.3)	5 (3.6)	32 (2.6)	15 (1.7)
Total	24 (4.8)		12 (2.9)		1		3		7 (2.5)		47 (2.1)	
Not applicable				3			5	12				
Total			3				17					
Grand Total	253	241	238	175	193	251	91	148	150	138	925	953

Table 16 : Showing Number of Drop-outs from Families where Father and Mother are Employed

		Dry		*Wet*		*Coastal*		*Hilly*		*I B*		*State*	
		Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
1. Field/farm workers	Boys	56 (22.1)	78 (32.3)	62 (21.8)	37 (21.1)	32 (16.4)	48 (19.2)	19 (20.8)	11 (7.4)	9 (6.0)	34 (24.6)	178 (17.4)	208 (20.1)
	Total	134 (27.2)		99 (21.9)		80 (17.8)		30 (14.1)		43 (15.3)		386 (18.7)	
	Girls	71 (28.1)	41 (17.0)	43 (18.1)	26 (14.8)	18 (8.2)	37 (14.7)	9 (9.8)	15 (10.1)	16 (10.6)	54 (38.6)	157 (14.9)	173 (19.4)
	Total	112 (22.5)		69 (16.4)		55 (11.4)		24 (9.9)		70 (24.6)		330 (17.1)	
		127 (50.2)	119 (49.3)	105 (39.9)	63 (35.9)	50 (25.9)	85 (33.8)	28 (30.7)	26 (17.5)	25 (16.6)	88 (63.0)	335 (32.6)	381 (39.9)
	Grand Total	246 (49.8)		168 (37.9)		135 (29.8)		54 (24.1)		113 (39.8)		716 (36.2)	
2. Non-farm workers	Boys	3 (1.1)		8 (3.3)		1 (0.5)			1 (1.0)	1 (6.6)	1 (0.7)	15 (2.5)	1 (0.1)
	Total									2 (3.6)		16 (1.3)	

	Girls	7 (2.7)		6 (2.5)	1 (0.5)		4 (1.6)	1 (1.0)				14 (1.2)	5 (3.2)
	Total	10 (3.8)		14 (6.5)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	4 (1.6)	2 (2.2)		1 (6.6)	1 (0.7)	28 (3.2)	6 (0.6)
	Grand Total	137	119	119	64	51	89	30	26	26	89	363	387
Not applicable					1			3					
	N R		2				44 (17.6)						
Grand Total		253	241	238	175	193	251	91	148	150	138	925	953

Table 17 : Income of the Fathers of Drop-outs Showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations

Level of Annual Income	Dry		Wet		Coastal		Hilly		I B		State	
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Below Rs. 500	54 (21.3)	6 (2.3)	32 (13.5)	20 (11.4)	1 (0.5)	6 (2.4)	3 (3.3)	4 (2.7)	1 (0.7)	41 (29.7)	91 (7.9)	77 (9.7)
Total	60 (12.1)		52 (12.6)		7 (1.4)		7 (2.9)		45 (15.6)		168 (8.9)	
501—1000	43 (17.0)	38 (15.7)	92 (38.7)	80 (45.7)	21 (10.9)	43 (17.1)	23 (25.3)	40 (27.0)	25 (16.7)	24 (17.4)	204 (21.7)	225 (23.6)
Total	81 (16.4)		172 (41.7)		64 (14.0)		63 (26.4)		49 (17.0)		429 (22.8)	
1001—2000	67 (26.6)	120 (49.8)	61 (25.6)	34 (19.4)	60 (31.1)	80 (31.9)	30 (33.0)	28 (18.9)	41 (27.3)	35 (25.4)	259 (28.0)	297 (31.2)
Total	187 (37.9)		95 (23.0)		140 (31.5)		58 (24.3)		76 (26.4)		556 (29.6)	
2001—3000	46 (18.2)	37 (15.4)	17 (7.1)	26 (14.9)	49 (24.4)	63 (25.1)	18 (19.8)	25 (16.9)	30 (20.0)	12 (8.7)	160 (17.3)	163 (17.1)
Total	83 (16.8)		43 (10.4)		112 (24.7)		43 (18.3)		42 (14.6)		323 (17.2)	
3001 - 4000	11 (4.4)	11 (4.5)	10 (4.2)	6 (3.4)	12 (6.2)	19 (7.6)	6 (6.6)	16 (10.8)	8 (5.3)	2 (1 5)	47 (5.1)	54 (5.7)
Total	22 (4.5)		16 (3.9)		31 (6.9)		22 (9.2)		10 (3 5)		101 (5.4)	

4001—5000	6 (2.4)	2 (0.8)	9 (3.8)	1 (0.6)	1 (0.5)	2 (0.8)	5 (5.5)	9 (6.1)	20 (13.3)	1 (0.7)	41 (4.4)	15 (1.6)
Total	8 (1.6)		10 (2.4)		3 (0.6)		14 (5.9)		21 (7.3)		56 (3.0)	
5001—10000	10 (4.0)	4 (1.7)	1 (0.4)	2 (1.2)	1 (0.5)	2 (0.8)		4 (2.7)	3 (2.3)	3 (2.2)	15 (1.6)	15 (1.6)
Total	14 (2.8)		3 (0.7)		3 (0.6)		4 (1.7)		6 (2.1)		30 (1.6)	
10001 - 15000		1 (0.4)				1 (0.4)			3 (2.0)	1 (0.7)	3 (0.3)	3 (0.3)
Total	1 (0 2)				1 (0 2)				4 (1.4)		6 (0.3)	
15001 and above												
Total												
No response	16 (6.3)	22 (9.1)	16 (6.7)		48 (24.9)	35 (13.9)		10 (6.8)	19 (12.7)	19 (13.8)	99 (10.7)	76 (8 0)
Total	38 (7 7)		16 (3.9)		83 (18.7)		10 (4.2)		38 (13.2)		185 (9.9)	
Not applicable				6 (3.4)			6 (6.6)	12 (8.1)			6 (0.6)	18 (1.9)
Total			6				18 (7.5)				24 (1.3)	
Grand Total	253	241	238	175	193	251	91	148	150	138	925	953
	494		413		444		239		288		1878	

Table 18 : Showing Mean Income, Median Income, Standard Deviation of Income and Skewness in the Distribution of Income of Fathers of Drop-outs for Different Regions in the State, Low-High Variations therein and the State as a Whole.

	Dry		*Wet*		*Coastal*		*Hilly*		*I B*		*State*	
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
Mean Income	1452	1598	1229	1150	1875	1780	1724	1828	2140	1100	1603	1517
Total	1523		1193		1814		1785		1628		1569	
Median Income	1246	1525	890	835	1830	1719	1550	1607	1890	885	1409	1382
Total	1425		500		1768		1578		1625		1395	
Standard Deviation	1029	810	1058	910	865	943	1131	1282	1315	812	1122	991
Total	932		995		915		1223		1036		1055	
Skewness	0.60	0.27	0.96	1.04	0.16	0.19	0.46	0.52	0.57	0.79	0.52	0.41
Total	0.31		2.09		0.15		0.51		0.01		0.47	

Table 19 : Income of the Mothers of Drop-out showing Region-wise and Low-High Variations

Level of Annual Income	Dry		Wet		Coastal		Hilly		I B		State	
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
Below Rs. 500	141 (55.7)	116 (48.1)	66 (27.7)	40 (23.0)	23 (12.0)	105 (41.8)	18 (19.7)	15 (10.1)	24 (16.0)	81 (58.7)	272 (29.3)	357 (37.4)
Total	257 (51.9)		106 (25.6)		128 (29.0)		33 (14.9)		105 (37.3)		629 (33.3)	
501—1000	3 (1.2)	4 (1.6)	34 (13.8)	24 (13.7)	15 (7.6)	24 (9.5)	18 (19.7)	13 (8.7)	2 (1.3)	5 (3.6)	72 (7.8)	70 (7.3)
Total	7 (1.4)		58 (13.7)		39 (8.8)		31 (14.2)		7 (2.4)		142 (7.5)	
1001—2000		1 (0.4)	3 (1.2)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	4 (1.5)	1 (1.1)	2 (1.3)		3 (2.1)	5 (0.5)	11 (1.1)
Total	1 (0.2)		4 (0.8)		5 (1.1)		3 (1.2)		3 (1.0)		16 (0.8)	
2001—3000												
Total												
3001—4000												
Total												
4001—5000												
Total												

Level of Income	Dry		Wet		Coastal		Hilly		I B		State	
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
5001—10000												
Total												
10001 - 15000												
Total												
15001 and above												
Total												
Not applicable	109 (43.1)	120 (49.9)	102 (43.6)	110 (62.8)	142 (64.7)	111 (44.5)	54 (59.5)	116 (78.6)	121 (82 7)	37 (26 9)	531 (57.6)	494 (52.0)
Total	229 (46.5)		212 (52.3)		253 (56.9)		170 (69.5)		161 (54.8)		1025 (54.8)	
No response			33 (13.7)		12 (6.2)	7 (2.7)		2 (1.3)		12 (8.8)	45 (4.8)	26 (2.2)
Total			33 (7.9)		19 (4.2)		2 (0.6)		12 (4 4)		66 (3.5)	
Grand Total	253	241	238	175	193	251	91	148	150	138	925	953

Table 20 : Showing the Social Background of Drop-outs in the State Including Low-High and Regional Variations.

Religion & Caste	Dry		Wet		Coastal		Hilly		I B		State	
	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Hindus	80.08	70.05	97.0	94.29	94.82	96.81	87.21	99.32	65.33	100.0	85.19	92 18
	(75.65)		(95.65)		(95.31)		(93.62)		(82.67)		(88.58)	
Brahmins	—	—	0.42	—	—	2 5			—	2 89	0.08	1.08
			(0.21)		(1.21)				(1.45)		(0.57)	
Agrl. caste	34.78	32.74	72.2	19.40	39.89	51.9	23.75	39.02	13.27	43.48	36 77	37.14
	(33.76)		(50.1)		(46.7)		(31.48)		(28.38)		(38.1)	
Servicing & Artisans	27.06	31 55	11.69	57.06	34.43	39.05	27.5	10.0	27.55	2.89	25.65	37.22
	(29 31)		(31 3)		(37.3)		(18.75)		(15.22)		(26.4)	
Trading	—	0.59	1.29	—	—	—	—	5.2	13.27	—	2,91	6 25
	(0.29)		(0.65)				(2 6)		(6.64)		(1.58)	
Warriors & Soldiers	9.97	5 95	—	4.2	5.46	—	18.75	19.4	—	1.45	5.04	4 02
	(3.46)		(0.91)		(2.73)		(19.07)		(0.73)		(4.53)	
SC & ST	37.19	30 36	13.42	18.8	8.29	6 20	30.0	26.2	33.67	45.65	24.51	25.07
	(33.78)		(16.11)		(7.3)		(30.31)		(39.66)		(25.43)	
Muslims	7.51	27.80	2.52	4.60	1.55	0.41	10 99	0.66	34.67	—	11.45	6.69
	(17.66)		(3.55)		(0.97)		(5.84)		(17.34)		(9.0)	
Christians	—	0.41	—	—	3.63	2.40	1.09	—	—	—	0.94	0.56
	(0.21)				(1.82)		(0.55)				(0 75)	
Jains	—	0.41	—	1.1	—	0.40	—	—	—	—	—	0.44
	(0.21)		(0.57)		(0.19)						(0.22)	
No Response	9.88	0.41	1.26	5.71	7.77	—	—	—	3.06		3.78	1.22
	(5.15)		(3.49)		(3.89)				(1.53)		(2.50)	

Table 21 : Showing Duties of Drop-out Relating to Home Management (Inside the Home) Covering Regional. Low-High and Sex Variations.

Nature of duties inside home		*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
		Boys	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Looking after younger ones	Low	66 (60.0)	85 (59.5)	151 (59.7)	25 (19.5)	76 (69.0)	101 (44.2)	2 (1.7)	48 (64.0)	50 (32.8)
	High	58 (40.0)	53 (54.0)	111 (47.0)	47 (47.0)	57 (42.7)	104 (44.8)	64 (48.6)	88 (73.0)	152 (60.8)
	Total	124 (50.0)	138 (56.7)	262 (53.3)	72 (33.2)	133 (55.8)	205 (44.5)	66 (25.1)	136 (68.5)	202 (46.8)
Filling water	Low	98 (89.0)	90 (63.0)	188 (76.0)	31 (24.0)	79 (72 0)	110 (48.0)	7 (5.9)	35 (47.0)	42 (26.5)
	High	115 (80.0)	73 (74.0)	188 (77.0)	68 (68.0)	60 (45.0)	128 (56,5)	52 (39.0)	81 (67.2)	133 (53.1)
	Total	213 (64.5)	163 (68.5)	376 (66.5)	99 (46.0)	139 (58.5)	238 (52.2)	59 (22.5)	116 (57.1)	175 (39.8)
Cooking	Low	13 (11.0)	97 (67.9)	110 (39.4)	2 (1.5)	45 (41.0)	47 (21.2)	3 (2.5)	17 (22 5)	20 (12.5)
	High	15 (10.5)	72 (73.0)	87 (41.8)	21 (21.0)	30 (22.5)	51 (21.8)	6 (4.5)	76 (63.0)	82 (33.8)
	Total	28 (10.8)	169 (70-4)	197 (40.6)	23 (11 2)	75 (32.7)	98 (22.0)	9 (3.5)	93 (42.8)	102 (23.1)

Table 21 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Work assistance to father/mother	Low	65 (59.0)	67 (46.9)	132 (53.0)	24 (19.0)	55 (50.0)	79 (34.5)	14 (11.7)	13 (17.5)	27 (14.6)
	High	29 (20.3)	40 (40.0)	69 (30.1)	96 (96.0)	39 (29.7)	135 (62.8)	34 (25.5)	70 (58.1)	104 (41.8)
	Total	94 (39.7)	117 (43.4)	201 (41-6)	120 (57.5)	94 (39.8)	214 (48.6)	48 (18.6)	83 (38.8)	131 (20.7)

Table 21 (Contd.)

Nature of duties inside home		Hilly			I B			State		
		Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Eirls	Total
Cleaning house	Low		2	2	2	60	62	82	224	306
			(5.7)	(2.2)	(3.4)	(66.0)	(41.3)	(17.2)	(44.1)	(31.1)
	High	13	6	19	7	67	74	82	136	218
		(16.0)	(9 0)	(12.6)	(14.0)	(77.0)	(55.5)	(18.2)	(30.5)	(24.3)
	Total	13	8	21	9	127	136	164	360	524
		(9.5)	(7.9)	(8.9)	(8 1)	(71 5)	(46.0)	(17.7)	(37.7)	(27.8)
Cleaning vessels	Low	2	10	12	3	72	75	37	272	309
		(3.6)	(28 5)	(13.2)	(5.0)	(79.2)	(50.0)	(77.8)	(53.5)	(31.4)
	High	23	9	32	2	80	82	71	216	287
		(28.2)	(13.5)	(21.2)	(4.0)	(92.0)	(61.5)	(15.7)	(48 5)	(32.1)
	Total	25	19	44	5	152	157	108	488	596
		(17.8)	(18.6)	(18.0)	(4.5)	(85.5)	(53.0)	(10.5)	(51.2)	(31.6)
Washing clothes	Low	2	9	11	5	51	56	70	230	300
		(3.6)	(25.6)	(12.1)	(8 5)	(56.1)	(38.0)	(14.7)	(45.2)	(30.5)
	High	32	8	40	2	59	61	143	224	367
		(39.3)	(12.0)	(26.6)	(4.0)	(67.9)	(45.0)	(31.7)	(50.3)	(41.0)
	Total	34	17	51	7	110	117	213	454	667
		(24.3)	(16 8)	(21.2)	(6.3)	(62.0)	(39.0)	(23 0)	(47 6)	(35.5)
Total	Low	56	35	91	60	90	150	475	450	925
	High	81	67	148	51	87	136	508	445	953
	Total	137	102	239	111	187	288	983	895	1878

Table 21 (Contd.)

Nature of duties inside home		*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
		Boys	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
Cleaning house	Low	25 (22.0)	56 (39.2)	81 (30.6)	13 (10.0)	64 (58.0)	77 (34.0)	8 (6.7)	42 (56.0)	50 (31.4)
	High	33 (23.1)	10 (10.0)	43 (21.5)	23 (23.0)	13 (9.7)	36 (16.4)	6 (4.5)	40 (33.2)	46 (18.8)
	Total	58 (22.5)	66 (24.6)	124 (23.5)	36 (16.5)	77 (33.8)	113 (25.2)	14 (5.6)	82 (44.6)	96 (25.1)
Cleaning vessels	Low	16 (14.5)	77 (53.9)	93 (34.2)	11 (8.5)	70 (64.0)	81 (36.3)	5 (4.2)	43 (47.5)	48 (25.8)
	High	36 (25.2)	13 (13.0)	49 (19.1)	6 (6.0)	50 (36.7)	56 (21.3)	4 (3.0)	64 (53.1)	68 (20.5)
	Total	52 (19.9)	90 (33.4)	142 (26.7)	17 (7.2)	120 (50.3)	137 (28.7)	9 (3.6)	107 (50.3)	116 (26.9)
Washing clothes	Low	54 (49.0)	94 (65.8)	148 (52.2)	5 (3.8)	50 (46.0)	55 (24.9)	4 (3.7)	26 (35.0)	30 (19.3)
	High	56 (39.2)	45 (46.0)	101 (42.6)	16 (16.0)	48 (36.0)	64 (26.0)	37 (27.7)	4 (53.1)	101 (40.4)
	Total	110 (44.1)	139 (60.9)	249 (52.5)	21 (9.9)	98 (41.0)	119 (25.5)	41 (15.7)	90 (44.5)	131 (30.1)
Grand Total	Low	111	142	253	129	109	238	119	74	193
	High	145	96	241	100	75	175	131	120	251
	Total	256	238	494	229	184	413	250	194	444

Table 21 (Contd.)

Nature of duties outside home		*Hilly*			*IB*			*State*		
		Boys	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Looking after younger ones	Low	1 (1.8)	7 (20.0)	8 (9.0)	9 (15.3)	64 (70.4)	73 (48.6)	103 (21.7)	280 (55.1)	383 (38.9)
	High	38 (46.9)	21 (31.5)	59 (39.2)	32 (64.0)	68 (75.1)	102 (72.4)	239 (53.1)	287 (64.4)	526 (58.7)
	Total	39 (24.2)	28 (27.0)	67 (25.0)	41 (36.9)	132 (70.0)	173 (58.0)	342 (36.9)	487 (51.1)	829 (44.1)
Filling water	Low		7 (20.0)	7 (9.0)	11 (18.7)	72 (80.2)	83 (56.0)	147 (30.9)	283 (55.7)	430 (43.6)
	High	29 (35.3)	9 (13.5)	38 (24.6)	21 (42.0)	81 (93.1)	102 (75.0)	285 (63.3)	304 (68.3)	589 (65.8)
	Total	29 (17.8)	16 (16.0)	45 (18.0)	32 (28.8)	153 (86.6)	185 (62.0)	432 (46.6)	587 (61.5)	1019 (54.2)
Cooking	Low		3 (7.5)	3 (3.3)	1 (1.7)	42 (46.2)	43 (28.6)	19 (4.0)	204 (40.1)	223 (22.6)
	High	24 (29.5)	5 (7.5)	29 (20.0)	5 (10.0)	45 (51.7)	50 (37.0)	72 (16.0)	220 (51.0)	300 (33.5)
	Total	24 (17.5)	8 (7.9)	32 (12.8)	6 (5.4)	87 (48.9)	93 (31.0)	91 (9.8)	432 (45.3)	523 (27.8)

Table 21 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Work assistance to father/mother	Low	11 (19.8)	21 (57.7)	32 (35.6)	22 (37.4)	56 (60.6)	78 (52.0)	136 (28.6)	212 (41.5)	348 (35.4)
	High	44 (54.1)	40 (60.0)	84 (56.0)	21 (42.0)	62 (72.3)	83 (62.5)	224 (49.8)	254 (56.4)	475 (53.1)
	Total	55 (40.0)	61 (60.0)	116 (48.0)	43 (38.7)	118 (66.5)	161 (54.0)	360 (38.9)	463 (48.5)	823 (43.8)

Table 22 : Duties of Drop-out Outside the Home with Regional, Low-high and Sex Variations

Nature of duties outside home		Dry			Wet			Coastal		
		Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Looking after cattle/ pigs poultry	Low	91 (82.0)	93 (65.4)	184 (73.7)	89 (69.0)	29 (26.6)	118 (49.6)	51 (42.8)	21 (28.4)	72 (37.3)
	High	25 (17.2)	72 (75.0)	97 (40.3)	58 (58.0)	38 (50.6)	96 (54.3)	46 (35.1)	39 (32.5)	85 (33.9)
	Total	116 (45.3)	165 (59.3)	281 (56.9)	147 (64.1)	67 (36.4)	214 (51.8)	97 (38.8)	60 (30.9)	157 (35.4)
Collect cowdung	Low	70 (63.0)	61 (43.0)	131 (51.8)	28 (21.6)	6 (5.5)	34 (13.5)	42 (35.2)	26 (35.1)	68 (35.2)
	High	20 (13.1)	34 (35.4)	54 (22.4)	2 (2.0)	12 (16.0)	14 (9.0)	38 (29.0)	27 (22.5)	65 (25.9)
	Total	90 (35.1)	95 (39.4)	185 (37.5)	30 (13.1)	18 (97.8)	48 (55.5)	80 (32.0)	53 (27.3)	133 (29.9)
Collect Firewood	Low	75 (67.5)	69 (48.5)	144 (56.9)	42 (32.5)	12 (11.0)	54 (21.7)	39 (32.5)	15 (20.3)	54 (27.9)
	High	30 (20.6)	40 (41.6)	70 (29.1)	54 (54.0)	50 (66.6)	104 (60.3)	58 (44.2)	57 (47.5)	115 (45.8)
	Total	105 (41.1)	109 (45.8)	214 (43.3)	96 (41.5)	62 (33.6)	158 (37.6)	97 (38.8)	72 (37.1)	169 (38.1)

Table 22 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Shopping	Low	75 (67.5)	64 (45.1)	139 (54.9)	26 (20.2)	3 (2.7)	29 (11.5)	—	—	—
	High	51 (35.1)	35 (36.4)	86 (35.7)	36 (36.0)	15 (20.0)	51 (28.0)	57 (43.5)	57 (47.5)	114 (45.4)
	Total	126 (49.2)	99 (41.6)	225 (45.5)	62 (27.7)	18 (9.8)	80 (18.7)	57 (22.8)	57 (29.4)	114 (25.7)
Work assistance to father/mother	Low	82 (73.8)	74 (52.1)	156 (61.7)	31 (24.0)	8 (7.3)	39 (15.7)	8 (6.7)	2 (2.7)	10 (5.2)
	High	25 (17.3)	25 (26.1)	50 (21.7)	19 (19.0)	8 (10.6)	27 (14.8)	50 (38.2)	39 (32.5)	89 (35.5)
	Total	107 (41.8)	99 (41.6)	206 (41.7)	50 (21.8)	16 (8.6)	66 (15.2)	58 (23.2)	41 (21.1)	99 (22.3)
Total	Low	393	361	754	216	58	274	140	64	204
	High	151	206	357	169	123	292	249	219	468
	Total	544	567	1111	385	181	566	389	283	672
	Low	111	142	253	129	109	238	119	74	193
	High	145	96	241	100	75	175	131	120	251
	Total	256	238	494	229	184	413	250	194	444

Table 22 (Contd.)

Nature of duties inside home		*Hilly*			*IB*			*State*		
		Boys	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Looking after cattle/ pigs/ poultry	Low	3 (5.4)	5 (14.3)	8 (8.8)	43 (71.7)	35 (38.9)	78 (52.0)	277 (58.3)	183 (40.7)	460 (49.7)
	High	8 (9.9)	28 (41.8)	36 (24.3)	40 (78.4)	49 (56.3)	89 (64.5)	177 (34.8)	233 (52.4)	410 (43.0)
	Total	11 (8.0)	33 (32.4)	44 (18.4)	83 (74.8)	84 (47.5)	167 (57.9)	454 (46.2)	409 (45.7)	863 (45.9)
Collect cowdung	Low	—	1 (2.9)	1 (1.1)	23 (38.3)	46 (51.1)	69 (46.0)	163 (34.3)	140 (31.1)	303 (32.8)
	High	10 (12.4)	16 (23.9)	26 (17.6)	16 (31.4)	31 (35.6)	47 (34.1)	86 (16.9)	120 (26.9)	206 (21.6)
	Total	10 (7.3)	17 (16.7)	27 (11.3)	39 (35.1)	77 (43.5)	116 (40.3)	249 (25.3)	260 (29.1)	509 (27.1)
Collect Firewood	Low	1 (14.3)	9 (25.7)	17 (18.7)	30 (50.0)	43 (47.8)	73 (48.7)	194 (40.8)	148 (32.9)	342 (36.9)
	High	11 (22.2)	25 (37.3)	43 (29.1)	22 (43.1)	34 (39.1)	56 (40.6)	182 (35.8)	206 (46.5)	388 (40.7)
	Total	26 (18.9)	34 (33.3)	63 (25.1)	527 (46.9)	7 (43.5)	129 (44.8)	376 (38.3)	354 (39.6)	730 (38.9)

Table 22 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Shopping	Low	1 (1.8)	1 (2.9)	2 (2.2)	4 (6.7)	6 (6.7)	10 (16.7)	106 (22.3)	74 (16.4)	180 (19.5)
	High	2 (2.5)	2 (2.9)	4 (2.7)	9 (17.7)	35 (40.2)	44 (31.9)	155 (30.5)	144 (32.4)	299 (31.4)
	Total	3 (2.2)	3 (2.9)	6 (2.5)	13 (11.7)	41 (23.2)	54 (18.8)	261 (26.6)	218 (24.4)	479 (25.5)
Work assistance to father/mother	Low	7 (12.5)	18 (51.4)	25 (27.5)	25 (41.7)	17 (18.9)	42 (28.0)	153 (32.2)	119 (26.4)	272 (29.4)
	High	10 (12.4)	36 (53.8)	46 (31.1)	25 (49.0)	42 (48.3)	67 (48.6)	129 (25.4)	150 (33.7)	279 (29.3)
	Total	17 (12.4)	54 (52.9)	71 (29.7)	50 (45.1)	59 (33.3)	109 (37.9)	282 (28.7)	269 (30.1)	551 (29.3)
Total	Low	19	34	53	125	147	272	893	664	1557
	High	48	107	155	112	191	303	729	846	1575
	Total	67	141	208	237	338	575	1622	1510	3132
	Low	56	35	91	60	90	150	474	450	925
	High	81	67	148	51	87	138	508	445	953
	Total	137	102	239	111	177	288	983	895	1878

Table 23 : Showing Sex-wise Distribution of Drop-outs in Low-High Drop-out Areas in Different Regions of the State Engaged in Out-of-home Domestic Duties during Morning, Afternoon and Evening Times of the Day :

Times of duties of drop-out		*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
		Boys	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Morning	Low	100 (90.1)	117 (82.4)	217 (85.8)	97 (75.2)	88 (80.7)	185 (77.7)	66 (55.5)	57 (77.0)	123 (63.7)
	High	101 (69.7)	91 (94.8)	192 (79.7)	74 (74.0)	75 (100.0)	149 (85.1)	113 (86.3)	96 (80.0)	209 (83.3)
	Total	201 (76.9)	208 (87.4)	409 (82.8)	171 (74.7)	163 (88.6)	334 (80.9)	179 (71.6)	143 (73.7)	332 (74.8)
Afternoon	Low	82 (73.9)	73 (51.4)	155 (61.3)	90 (69.8)	85 (77.9)	175 (73.5)	66 (55.5)	56 (75.7)	122 (63.2)
	High	78 (53.8)	95 (98.9)	173 (71.8)	78 (78.0)	59 (78.7)	137 (78.3)	91 (69.5)	76 (63.3)	167 (66.5)
	Total	160 (62.5)	168 (70.6)	328 (66.4)	168 (73.4)	144 (78.3)	312 (75.5)	157 (62.8)	132 (68.0)	289 (65.1)
Evening	Low	90 (81.1)	103 (72.5)	193 (76.3)	97 (75.2)	88 (80.7)	185 (77.7)	22 (18.5)	51 (68.9)	73 (37.8)
	High	130 (89.7)	95 (98.9)	225 (93.4)	70 (70.0)	35 (46.7)	105 (60.0)	103 (78.6)	95 (79.2)	198 (78.9)
	Total	220 (85.9)	198 (83.2)	418 (84.6)	167 (72.9)	123 (66.8)	290 (70.2)	125 (50.0)	146 (75.3)	271 (61.0)

Table 23 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
All times	Low									
	High									
	Total									
Total	Low	111	142	253	129	109	238	119	74	193
	High	145	96	241	100	75	175	131	120	251
	Total	256	238	494	229	184	413	250	194	444

Table 23 (Contd.)

Times of duties of drop-out		Hilly			IB			State		
		Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Morning	Low	11 (19.6)	25 (71.4)	36 (39.6)	50 (83.3)	84 (93.3)	134 (89.3)	324 (68.2)	371 (82.4)	795 (85.9)
	High	21 (25.9)	13 (19.4)	34 (22.9)	45 (88.2)	86 (98.9)	131 (94.9)	354 (68.7)	361 (81.1)	715 (75.0)
	Total	32 (23.4)	38 (37.3)	70 (29.3)	95 (85.6)	170 (96.0)	365 (92.0)	678 (68.9)	722 (80.7)	1400 (74.5)
Afternoon	Low	3 (5.4)	10 (28.6)	13 (14.3)	50 (83.3)	84 (93.3)	134 (89.3)	291 (68.3)	308 (68.4)	599 (64.8)
	High	10 (12.3)	14 (20.9)	24 (16.2)	41 (80.4)	77 (88.5)	118 (85.5)	298 (58.7)	321 (72.1)	619 (64.9)
	Total	13 (9.5)	24 (23.5)	37 (15.5)	91 (81.9)	161 (90.9)	252 (87.5)	589 (59.9)	629 (70.3)	1218 (64.9)
Evening	Low	11 (19.6)	25 (71.4)	36 (39.6)	14 (23.3)	57 (63.3)	71 (47.3)	234 (49.3)	324 (72.0)	558 (60.3)
	High	11 (13.6)	16 (23.9)	27 (18.2)	44 (86.3)	55 (63.2)	99 (71.7)	358 (70.5)	296 (66.5)	654 (68.6)
	Total	22 (16.1)	41 (40.2)	63 (26.4)	58 (52.3)	112 (63.3)	170 (59.0)	592 (60.2)	620 (69.3)	1212 (64.5)

Table 23 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
All times	Low									
	High									
	Total									
Total	Low	56	35	91	60	90	150	475	450	925
	High	81	67	148	51	87	138	508	445	953
	Total	137	102	233	111	177	288	983	895	1878

Table 24 : Showing the Number of Hours of Work Put in by Drop-outs in Discharge of Domestic Duties Either Inside the Home or Outside Covering Regional, Low-high and Sex Variations :

No. of hours of work of the drop-out in domestic duties		*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
		Boys	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
One hour	Low	2 (1.8)	2 (1.4)	4 (1.5)	1 (0.8)		1 (0.4)			
	High	16 (11.0)	1 (0.7)	17 (7.1)	4 (4.0)	4 (5.3)	8 (4.6)	1 (0.8)		1 (0.4)
	Total	18 (7.0)	3 (1.3)	21 (4.3)	5 (2.2)	4 (2.2)	9 (2.2)	1 (0.4)		1 (0.2)
Two hours	Low	7 (6.3)	23 (16.2)	30 (11.9)	— —	2 (1.8)	2 (0.8)	— —	— —	— —
	High	14 (9.7)	7 (7.3)	21 (8 7)	2 (2.0)	5 (6.6)	7 (4.0)	15 (11.5)	5 (0.8)	20 (7.9)
	Total	21 (8.2)	30 (12.6)	51 (10.3)	2 (0.9)	7 (3.8)	9 (2.2)	15 (6.0)	5 (2.6)	20 (4.5)
Three & Four hours	Low	13 (11.7)	34 (23.9)	47 (18.6)	5 (3.9)	5 (4.6)	10 (4.2)	20 (16.8)	8 (10.8)	28 (14.5)
	High	17 (11.7)	25 (26.0)	42 (17.4)	24 (24.0)	15 (20.0)	39 (22.3)	24 (18.3)	32 (26.7)	56 (22.3)
	Total	30 (11.7)	59 (24.8)	89 (18.0)	29 (12.7)	20 (10.9)	49 (11.9)	44 (17.6)	40 (20.6)	84 (10.9)

Table 24 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Five & Six hours	Low	7 (6.3)	7 (4.9)	14 (5.5)	15 (6.6)	23 (21.1)	38 (15.9)	36 (30.3)	37 (50.0)	73 (37.8)
	High	20 (13.8)	20 (20.8)	40 (16.6)	47 (47.0)	40 (53.3)	87 (49.7)	19 (14.5)	23 (19.2)	42 (16.7)
	Total	27 (10.5)	27 (11.3)	54 (10.9)	62 (27.1)	63 (34.2)	125 (30.3)	55 (22.0)	60 (30.9)	115 (25.9)
Seven & Eight hours	Low	55 (49.5)	65 (45.8)	120 (47.4)	31 (24.0)	44 (40.4)	75 (31.5)	— —	2 (2 7)	2 (1.0)
	High	48 (33.1)	59 (61.5)	107 (44.4)	4 (4.0)	2 (2.7)	6 (3.4)	31 (23.7)	49 (40.8)	80 (31.8)
	Total	103 (40.2)	124 (52.1)	227 (45.9)	35 (15.3)	46 (25.0)	81 (19.6)	31 (12.4)	51 (26.3)	82 (18.5)
More than Eight hours	Low	—	1 (0.7)	1 (0.4)	7 (5.4)	9 (8.3)	16 (6.7)	—	—	—
	High	1 (0.7)	—	1 (0 4)	—	—	—	1 (0.8)	2 (1.7)	3 (1.2)
	Total	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	2 (0.4)	7 (3.1)	9 (4.9)	16 (3.9)	1 (0.4)	2 (1.0)	3 (0 7)
	Low	111	142	253	129	109	238	119	74	193
	High	145	96	241	100	75	175	131	120	251
	Total	256	238	494	229	184	413	250	194	444

Table 24 (Contd.)

No. of hours of work of the drop-out in domestic duties		*Hilly*			*IB*			*State*		
		Boys	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
One hour	Low							3 (0.21)	2 (0.4)	5 (0.5)
	High	1 (1.2)	1 (1.5)	2 (1.4)				22 (4.3)	6 (1.3)	28 (2.9)
	Total	1 (0.7)	1 (0.9)	2 (0.8)				25 (2.5)	8 (0.9)	33 (1.8)
Two hours	Low				2 (3.3)		2 (1.3)	9 (1.9)	25 (5.6)	34 (3.7)
	High	6 (7.4)	2 (2.9)	8 (5.4)				37 (7.3)	19 (4.3)	56 (5.9)
	Total	6 (4.4)	2 (1.9)	8 (3.3)	2 (1.8)		2 (0.7)	46 (4.7)	44 (4.9)	90 (4.8)
Three & Four hours	Low	6 (10.7)	9 (25.7)	15 (16.5)	16 (26.7)	6 (6.7)	22 (14.7)	60 (12.6)	62 (13.8)	122 (13.2)
	High	18 (22.2)	7 (10.4)	25 (16.9)	9 (17.6)	2 (2.3)	11 (7.9)	92 (18.1)	83 (18.7)	175 (18.4)
	Total	24 (17.5)	16 (17.7)	40 (16.7)	25 (22.5)	8 (4.5)	33 (11.5)	152 (15.5)	145 (16.2)	297 (15.8)

Table 24 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Five & Six hours	Low	7 (12.5)	15 (42.9)	22 (24.2)	31 (51.7)	39 (43.3)	70 (46.7)	96 (20.2)	121 (26.0)	217 (23.5)
	High	10 (12.3)	26 (38.8)	36 (24.8)	18 (35.3)	19 (21.8)	37 (26.8)	114 (22.4)	128 (28.8)	242 (24.3)
	Total	17 (20.9)	41 (40.2)	58 (24.3)	49 (44.1)	58 (32.8)	107 (37.2)	210 (21.4)	249 (27.8)	459 (24.4)
Seven & Eight hours	Low	1 (1.8)	2 (5.7)	3 (3.3)		35 (38.9)	35 (23.3)	87 (18.3)	148 (32.9)	235 (25.4)
	High	3 (3.7)	11 (16.4)	14 (9.5)	6 (11.8)	33 (37.9)	39 (28.3)	92 (18.1)	154 (34.6)	246 (25.8)
	Total	4 (2.9)	13 (12.7)	17 (7.1)	6 (5.4)	68 (38.4)	74 (25.7)	179 (18.2)	302 (33.7)	481 (25.6)
More than Eight hours	Low				1 (1.7)		1 (0.7)	8 (1.7)	10 (2.2)	18 (1.9)
	High	2 (2.5)		2 (1.4)	10 (19.6)	33 (37.9)	43 (31.2)	14 (2.8)	35 (7.9)	49 (5.1)
	Total	2 (1.5)		2 (0.9)	11 (9.9)	33 (18.6)	44 (15.3)	22 (2.2)	45 (5.0)	67 (3.5)
	Low	56	35	91	60	90	150	475	450	925
	High	81	67	148	51	87	138	508	445	953
	Total	137	102	239	111	177	288	983	895	1878

Table 25 : Showing the Distribution of Participation of Drop-outs in Paid Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Labour Covering Regional, Low-High and Sex Variations :

	Dry			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
	Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A. Dropouts engaged in paid agricultural labour									
No. of boys engaged	13 (11.7)	39 (26.9)	52 (20.3)	11 (8.5)	13 (13.0)	24 (10.5)	21 (17.6)	3 (2.3)	24 (9.6)
No. of girls engaged	17 (11.9)	1 (1.0)	18 (7.6)	11 (10.1)	5 (6.7)	16 (8.7)	2 (2.7)	5 (4.2)	7 (3.6)
Total	30 (11.9)	40 (16.6)	70 (14.2)	22 (9.2)	18 (10.3)	40 (9.7)	23 (11.9)	8 (3.2)	31 (6.9)
B. Dropouts engaged in paid non-agricultural labour									

Table 25 (Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
No. of boys engaged	15	14	29 (11.3)	6	3	9	6	37 (26.2)	43 (17.2)
No. of girls engaged	2		2	2	1	3		11 (9.2)	11 (5.7)
Total	17	14	31 (6.3)	8	4	12 (2.9)	6	48 (19.1)	54 (12.1)
Total sample									
Boys	111	145	256	129	100	229	119	131	250
Girls	142	96	238	102	75	184	74	120	193
Total	253	241	494	238	175	413	193	251	444

Table 25 (Contd.)

	Hilly			I B			State		
	Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A. Drop-outs engaged in paid agricultural labour									
No. of boys engaged	28 (50.0)	42 (51.9)	70 (51.1)	7 (11.7)	11 (21.6)	18 (16.2)	80 (16.8)	108 (21.3)	188 (19.1)
No. of girls engaged	14 (40.0)	11 (16.4)	25 (24.5)	5 (5.6)	14 (16.1)	19 (10.7)	49 (10.9)	36 (8.1)	85 (9.5)
Total	42 (46.2)	53 (35.8)	95 (39.7)	12 (8.0)	25 (18.1)	37 (12.8)	129 (13.9)	144 (15.1)	273 (14.5)

Table 25 (Contd.)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
B. Dropouts engaged in paid non-agricultural labour									
No. of boys engaged	1	3	4	1		1	29	57	86
							(6.1)	(11.2)	(8.7)
No. of girls engaged				3	1	4	7	13	20
							(1.6)	(2.9)	(2.2)
Total	1	3	4	4	1	5	36	70	106
							(3.9)	(7.3)	(5.6)
Total sample									
Boys	56	81	137	60	51	111	475	508	983
Girls	35	67	102	90	87	177	450	445	895
Total	91	148	239	150	138	288	925	953	1878

Table 26 : Showing Annual Income of Drop-outs in Paid Agricultural Labour Covering Regional Low-High and Sex-Variations.

Annual Income of the drop-out in paid agrl. work		*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
		Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Below Rs. 100	Boys	11	1	12	5	1	6	3	—	3
	Girls	15	1	16	5	3	8	—	3	3
	Total	26	2	28	10	4	14	3	3	6
				(40.0)			(35.0)			(20.0)
101-200	Boys	2	20	22	2	11	13	4	1	5
	Girls	1	—	1	2	2	4	—	1	1
	Total	3	20	23	4	13	17	4	2	6
				(33.0)			(43.0)			(20.0)
201-300	Boys	—	12	12	1	—	1	3	1	4
	Girls	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	1	2
	Total	—	12	12	2		2	4	2	6
				(17.0)			(5.0)			(20.0)
301-500	Boys	—	3	3	1	—	1	6	1	7
	Girls	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1
	Total	1	3	4	1	—	1	7	1	8
										(25.0)

Table 26 (Contd.)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
501-750	Boys	—	1	1	—	—	—	2	—	2
	Girls	—	—	—	3	—	3	—	—	—
	Total	—	1	1	3	—	3	2	—	2
N R	Boys	—	5	5	1	1	2	3	—	3
	Girls	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—
	Total	—	5	5	2	1	3	3	—	3
Total	Boys	13	39	52	11	13	24	21	3	24
	Girls	17	1	18	11	5	16	2	5	7
	Total	30	40	70	22	18	40	23	8	31

(Contd.)

Table 26 (Contd.)

Annual Income of the Drop-out in paid agrl. work		*Hilly*			*IB*			*State*		
		Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Rs. 100	Boys	1	—	1	—	3	3	20	5	25
	Girls	1	1	2	—	5	5	21	13	34
	Total	2	1	3	—	8	8 (22.0)	41 (7.75)	18 (16.6)	59 (21.6)
101-200	Boys	1	2	3	1	—	1	10	34	44
	Girls	2	1	3	1	5	6	6	9	15
	Total	3	3	6	2	5	7 (19.0)	16 (12.4)	43 (29.8)	59 (21.6)
201-300	Boys	6	19	25	2	4	6	12	36	48
	Girls	4	4	8	—	2	2	6	7	13
	Total	10	23	33 (34.0)	2	6	8 (22.0)	18	43 (29.8)	61 (22.3)
301-500	Boys	16	15	31	—	4	4	23	23	46
	Girls	3	2	5	—	1	1	5	3	8
	Total	19	17	36 (37.0)	—	5	5 (13.0)	28	26 (18.0)	54 (19.7)

Table 26 (Contd.)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
501-750	Boys	4	5	9	—	—	—	6	6	12
	Girls	4	3	7	—	—	—	7	3	10
	Total	8	8	16 (17.0)	—	—	—	13 (10.0)	9 (6.2)	22 (8.0)
N R	Boys	—	1	1	4	—	4	—	—	—
	Girls	—	—	—	4	1	5	—	—	—
	Total	—	1	1	8	1	9	—	—	—
Total	Boys	28	42	70	7	11	18	80	108	188
	Girls	14	11	25	5	14	19	49	36	85
	Total	42	53	95	12	25	37	129	144	273

Table 27 : Showing Monthly Income of Drop-outs Engaged in Paid Non-agricultural Labour Covering Regional, Low-High and Sex Variations

Monthly Incom e of Drop -outs engaged in paid non-agrl. work		*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
		Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Less than Rs. 25	Boys	11	10	21	2	2	4	1	5	6
	Girls	2	—	2	—	1	1	—	7	7
	Total	13	10	23	2	3	5	1	12	13
26-50	Boys	1	2	3	3	—	3	2	14	16
	Girls		—		2		2		1	1
	Total	1	2	3	5	—	5	2	15	17
51-75	Boys	—	1	1	—	—	—	1	6	7
	Girls	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
	Total	—	1	1	—	—	—	1	7	8
								—	2	2
76-100	Boys	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Girls	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2
	Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	6

Table 27 (Contd.)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
101-150	Boys	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	6
	Girls	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
151-200	Boys	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	4	4
	Girls	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Total	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	4	4
201-250	Boys	1	—	1						
	Girls									
	Total	1	—	1						
251 and more	Boys	2	—	2						
	Girls									
	Total	2	—	2						
Total	Boys	15	14	29	6	3	9	6	37	43
	Girls	2	—	2	2	1	3	—	11	11
	Total	17	14	31	8	4	12	6	48	54

(Contd.)

Table 27 (Contd.)

Monthly Income of drop-outs engaged in paid non-agrl. work		*Hilly*			*I B*			*State*		
		Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Less than Rs. 25	Boys							14	17	31
	Girls				2	1	3	14	9	13
	Total				2	1	3	18	26	44
								(50.0)	(37.1)	(41.5)
26-50	Boys							6	16	22
	Girls				1	—	1	3	1	4
	Total				1	—	1	9	17	26
									(24.2)	(24.5)
51-75	Boys							1	7	8
	Girls							—	1	1
	Total							1	8	9
76-100	Boys							—	2	2
	Girls							—	—	—
	Total							—	2	2

Table 27 (Contd.)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
101-150	Boys							—	6	6
	Girls							—	—	—
	Total							—	6	6
151-200	Boys	—	2	2				—	7	7
	Girls	—	—	—				—	—	—
	Total	—	2	2				—	7	7
201-250	Boys							1	—	1
	Girls							—	—	—
	Total							1	—	1
251 and More	Boys	1	—	1				3	—	3
	Girls	—	—	—				—	—	—
	Total	1	—	1				3	—	3
Total	Boys	1	3	4	1	—	1	29	57	86
	Girls	—	—	—	3	1	4	7	13	20
	Total	1	3	4	4	1	5	36	70	106

Table 28 : Mean and Median Annual Income of Drop-outs in Paid Agricultural Work Showing Regional and Low-High Variations

	Dry		*Wet*		*Coastal*		*Hilly*		*I B*		*State*	
	Low	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*	*Low*	*High*
Mean Income	72 16	209.05	194.25	126.97	290.67	161.75	380.23	347.61	200.5	194.25	224.25	246.0
Total	(148.66)		(163.33)		(255.85)		(359.01)		(195.14)		(245.21)	
Median Income	43.80	116.5	101.5	166.88	226.5	151.5	369.92	205.84	225.5	121 5	295.9	281 73
Total	(175.41)		(175.83)		(268.17)		(387.61)		(114.5)		(285,9)	
Mean and Median Monthly Income of drop-outs in paid non-agricultural work :												
Mean Income	57.55	19.92				59.19					51.43	62.31
Total	(41.25)		(35.04)		(57.3)		(208.03)		(18.0)		(53.12)	
Median Income	2.46	12.75									4.2	41.21
Total	(10.19)		(49.0)		(33.85)		(164.0)		(9.83)		(46.69)	

As the entries in the low-high areas of Wet, Hilly and I B are negligible, Mean monthly income of drop-outs in paid non-agricultural work is not presented here.

Table 29 : Showing Child Labour and Drop-out Phenomenon in Karnataka State (Rural)

	Children in the range 0-4	*Children in the range 5-14*			*Total*
		School going	*Drop-outs**	*Non-enrolled*	
Percentage in total population (Karnataka State)	45.0	34.0	20.0	1.0	100.0
Percentage working in the State	0.0	0.0	? (4.0) (Results of the study magnified for the State)	(7.55—4.0) ?=3.55	7.55
Percentage working in the sample	Not applicable	Not applicable	20.1	Not applicable	20.1

Total Number of drop-outs covered in the study=1878

Percentage working=20.1

If for 100 drop-outs in the study 20 are working for 20 drop-outs in the State 20×20 ÷100=4.0. Hence 4.0 per cent out of 7.55 per cent working children in the State are drop-outs from school (53.0 per cent of child labourers are drop-outs from school).

* At the time of reference of the study (and based on the study) the total number of drop-outs taking into consideration all the seven standards of primary education worked out to be 36.0 per cent. 36.0 per cent of 54 wil be around 20 drop-out children. (100 children in 0-4 age group—45 in 0-4 and 1 per cent non-enrolled).

Table 30 : Showing Rural Marriage Data on Drop-out Girls Covering Regional and Low-High Variations

A. Expense on Marriage

Money spent on marriage	*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
	High	*Low*	*Total*	*High*	*Low*	*Total*	*High*	*Low*	*Total*
Below 1000	2	6	8	2	6	8	10	7	17
1001- 2000	27 (66.1)	20 (59.4)	47 (63.4)	9 (26.6)	29 (68.0)	38 (43.6)	10 (48.6)	41 (83.3)	51 (70.1)
2001- 3000	65 (90.9)	31 (90.6)	96 (90.7)	18 (64.2)	16 (98.7)	34 (78.3)	16 (85.1)	52 (95.8)	68 (91.7)
3001- 5000	35	30	65	41	23	64	27	15	42
5001- 8000	8	7	15	29	—	29	7	3	10
8001-10000	3	2	5	9	1	10	2	1	3
10001-12000	1	—	1				2 (1.35)	—	2
12001-15000	1 (1.4)	—	1				—	1 (0.8)	1 (1.5)
15001 & above				1 (0.9)	—	1 (0.5)			
NR									
Total	142	96	238	109	75	184	74	120	194

(Contd.)

B. Payment of Dowry

Dowry paid	133 (93.7)	61 (63.5)	194 (81.5)	106 (97.2)	44 (58.7)	150 (81.5)	47 (63.5)	60 (50.0)	107 (55.2)
Dowry not paid	8	35	43	1	31	32	26	59	85
N R	1		1	2		2	1	1	2
Total	142	96	238	109	75	184	74	120	194

C. Amount of Dowry Demanded by Bridegroom's Party

Dowry Demanded by Bridegroom's party									
Below Rs. 500	36	11	47	1	3	4		7	7
501-1000	34 (77.4)	13 (68.9)	47 (74.7)	11 (49.1)	19 (84.1)	30 (59.3)	11 (61.7)	28 (86.7)	39 (75.7)
1001-2000	33 (91.7)	18 (90.2)	51 (91.2)	40 (70.8)	15 (90.9)	55 (76.7)	18 (82.9)	17 (93.3)	35 (88.8)
2001-3000	19	13	32	23	3	26	10	4	14
3001-4000	2	4	6	23		23	6		6
4001-5000	5	2	7	1		1	1		1
5001 & above	3		3	1	4	5	1	2	3
N R	1		1	6		6		2	2
Total	133	61	194	106	44	150	47	60	107

Table 30 (Contd.)

A. Expense on Marriage

Money spent on marriage	*Hilly*			*I B*			*State*		
	Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
Below 100	2	2	4	11	10	21	27	31	58
1001- 2000	6 (60.0)	4 (25.4)	10 (37.3)	11 (32.2)	25 (61.9)	36 (45,9)	63 (46.4)	119 (62.2)	82 (54.3)
2001- 3000	13 (80.0)	11 (40.3)	24 (53.9)	7 (58.9)	17 (82.1)	24 (69.5)	119 (76.2)	147 (83.6)	246 (79.9)
3001- 5000	7	10	17	24	17	41	134	95	229
5001- 8000	5	2	7	23	5	28	72	17	89
8001-10000	2	16	18	8	7	15	24	27	51
10001-12000	—	7	7	3	2	5	6	9	15
12001-15000	—	5 (32.0)	5 (21.6)	3 (6.7)	1 (3.6)	4 (5.1)	1 (2.4)	7 (5.8)	8 (4.1)
15001 & above	—	10	10	—	3	3	4	10	14
N R					3	3	—	3	3
Total	35	67	102	90	87	177	450	455	895

B. Payment of Dowry

Dowry paid	19 (54.3)	61 (91.0)	80 (78.4)	84 (93.3)	84 (96.6)	168 (94.9)	389 (86.4)	310 (69.7)	699 (78.1)
Dowry not paid	16	5	21	6	3	9	57	133	190
N R	—	1	1				4	2	6
Total	35	67	102	90	87	177	450	445	895

C. Amount of Dowry Demanded by Bridegroom's party

Dowry demanded by Bridegroom's party									
Below Rs. 500	—	3	3	5	19	24	42	43	85
501-1000	2 (36.8)	9 (37.7)	11 (37.5)	20 (65.5)	26 (73.8)	46 (69.6)	78 (63.2)	95 (69 7)	173 (66.1)
1001-2000	5 (47.4)	11 (45 9)	16 (46.3)	30 (88.1)	17 (86.9)	47 (87.5)	126 (82.0)	78 (81.3)	204 (81.7)
2001-3000	2	5	7	19	11	30	73	36	109
3001-4000	4	6	10	2	3	5	37	13	50
4001-5000	1	1	2	5	1	6	13	4	17
5001 & above	—	23	23	3	2	5	8	31	39
N R	5	3	8	—	5	5	12	10	22
Total	19	61	80	84	84	168	389	310	699

(Contd.)

Table 30 (Contd.)

D. Dowry and Education of Bridegroom

Whether Dowry more for a graduate than for a non-graduate	*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
	Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
Yes	133	49	182	106	44	150	46	60	106
	(100.0)	(80.3)	(95.4)	(100 0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(97.9)	(100.0)	(99.1)
No	—	12	12				1	—	1
Total	133	61	194	106	44	150	47	60	107

E. Dowry and Employment of Bridegroom

Whether Dowry more for a Bridegroom in Govt. service	*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
	Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
Yes	133	47	180	106	34	140	46	60	106
	(100.0)	(77.0)	(92.8)	(100.0)	(77.3)	(93.3)	(97.8)	(106.0)	(99.1)
No	—	14	14	—	10	10	1	—	1
Total	133	61	194	106	44	150	47	60	107

F. Payment of Dowry as the Reason for Withdrawal of the Child

Whether child withdrawn because dowry has to be paid									
Yes	2 (1 4)	36 (37.5)	38 (15.9)	5 (4.6)	71 (94.7)	76 (41.3)	—	3 (2.5)	3 (1.5)
No	138	60	198	104	1	105	74	117	191
N R	2	—	2	—	3	3			
Total	142	96	238	109	75	184	74	120	194

(Contd.)

Table 30 (Contd.)

D. Dowry and Education of Bridegroom

Whether Dowry more for a graduate than for a non-graduate	*Hilly*			*I B*			*State*		
	Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
Yes	16 (84.2)	54 (96.7)	75 (93.8)	84 (100.0)	84 (100.0)	168 (100.0)	385 (98.9)	296 (95.5)	681 (97.4)
No	3	2	5				4 (1.0)	14 (4.5)	18 (2.6)
Total	19	61	80	84	84	168	389	310	699

E. Dowry and Employment of Bridegroom

Whether Dowry more for a Bridegroom in Govt. Service									
Yes	14 (73.7)	60 (98.4)	74 (92.5)	84 (100.0)	84 (100.0)	168 (100.0)	383 (98.5)	285 (91.9)	668 (95.6)
No	5	1	6				6	25	31
Total	19	61	80	84	84	168	389	310	669

F. **Payment of dowry as the reason for withdrawal of the child**

Whether child withdrawn because dowry has to be paid									
Yes	—	1	1	1	3	4	8	114	122
		(1.5)	(0.9)	(1.1)	(3.4)	(2.3)	(1.8)	(25.6)	(13.6)
No	35	66	101	89	84	173	440	328	768
N R							2	3	5
Total	35	67	102	90	87	177	450	445	895

Table 31 : Showing Reasons for Withdrawal of Children from Schools as Reported by the Parents Covering Regional, Low-High and Sex Variations.

Reasons for withdrawal of children from school		*Dry*			*Wet*			*Coastal*		
		Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Poverty	Boys	84	79	163	49	21	70	23	35	58
	Girls	48	52	100	39	14	53	4	27	31
	Total	132	131	263 (53.2)	88	35	123 (29.8)	27	62	89 (20.0)
To do household chores	Boys	21	7	28	24	12	36	8	14	22
	Girls	51	26	77	43	24	67	39	58	97
	Total	72	33	105 (21.3)	67	36	103 (24.9)	47	72	119 (26.8)
To take care of little ones	Boys	13	10	23	6	6	12	5	30	35
	Girls	15	13	28	37	12	49	25	49	74
	Total	28	23	51 (10.3)	43	18	61 (14.8)	30	79	129 (29.1)
Lack of interest in school	Boys	1	10	11	36	22	58	26	35	61
	Girls	2	6	8	7	21	28	18	12	30
	Total	3	16	19	43	43	86	44	47	91

Table 31 (Contd.)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
To rear cattles	Boys	14	10	24	54	20	74	32	25	57
	Girls	11	6	17	28	7	35	—	2	2
	Total	25	16	41 (8.3)	82	27	109 (26.4)	32	27	59 (13.3)
Others	Boys	3	21	24	14	15	29	7	32	39
	Girls	14	18	32	14	3	17	1	16	17
	Total	17	39	56	28	18	46	8	48	56
Distance of the school	Boys	1	4	5	5	—	5	2	5	7
	Girls	1	4	5	7	1	8	—	7	7
	Total	2	8	10	12	1	13	2	12	14
Parents' ill-health	Boys	—	2	2	3	1	4	—	3	3
	Girls	—	2	2	3	2	5	—	6	6
	Total	—	4	4	6	3	9	—	9	9
Peer influence	Boys	—	2	2	4	2	6	—	3	3
	Girls									
	Total	—	2	2	4	2	6	—	3	3

(Contd.)

Table 31 (Contd.)

Reasons for withdrawal of children from school		*Hilly*			*IB*			*State*		
		Low	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*	*Low*	*High*	*Total*
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Poverty	Boys	42	13	55	17	19	36	215	167	382 (38.9)
	Girls	16	5	21	33	28	61	140	126	266 (29.7)
	Total	58	18	76 (33.1)	50	47	97 (33.7)	355 (38.4)	293 (30.7)	648 (34.5)
To do household chores	Boys	5	13	18	9	1	10	67	47	114 (11.6)
	Girls	5	22	27	33	21	54	171	151	322 (35.9)
	Total	10	35	45 (18.8)	42	22	64 (22.2)	238 (25.7)	198 (20 8)	436 (23.2)
To take care of little ones	Boys	1	9	10	5	8	13	30	63	93 (9.5)
	Girls	7	13	20	37	41	78	121	128	249 (21.8)
	Total	8	22	30 (12.6)	42	49	91 (31.6)	151 (16.3)	191 (20.0)	342 (18.2)
Lack of interest in school	Boys	10	22	32	8	13	21	81	102	183 (18.6)
	Girls	10	5	15	7	12	19	44	56	100 (11.2)
	Total	20	27	47	15	25	40	125 (13.5)	158 (16.6)	283 (15.1)

Table 31 (Contd.)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
To rear cattles	Boys	—	6	6	22	11	33	122	72	194 (19.7)
	Girls				4	22	26	43	37	80 (8.9)
	Total	—	6	6 (2.5)	26	33	59 (20.5)	165 (17.8)	109 (11.4)	274 (14 6)
Others	Boys	5	13	18	11	6	17	40	87	127 (12.6)
	Girls	3	13	16	15	11	26	47	61	108 (12.1)
	Total	8	16	34	26	17	43	87	148	235 (12.5)
Distance of the school	Boys	—	5	5	—	1	1	8	15	23 (2.3)
	Girls	1	8	9	—	4	4	9	24	33 (3.7)
	Total	1	13	14	—	5	5	17	39	56 (2.9)
Parents' ill-health	Boys	1	3	4	—	2	2	4	11	15 (1.5)
	Girls	4	2	6	2	6	8	9	18	27 (3.0)
	Total	5	5	10	2	8	10	13	29	42 (2.2)
Peer influence	Boys	—	2	2	—	6	6	4	15	19 (1.9)
	Girls	—	1	1	—	4	4	—	6	6 (0.7)
	Total	—	3	3	—	10	10	4	21	25 (0.3)

Table 32 : Showing the Number of Schools and Teachers in Low-High Drop-out Areas

	Low Drop-out Areas				*High Drop-out Areas*		
Number of schools			38			42	
Break up of LPS & HPS	21	(LPS)	17	(HPS)	25	(HPS)	17(HPS)
Break up of LPS into single and multi-teacher schools	13	(ST)	8(MT)	—	21(ST)	4 (MT)	—
Number of teachers in each category	13	26	95		21	11	91
Total number of teachers in LPS & HPS		39	95			32	91
Total number of teachers in areas		134				123	
Teacher per standard of primary education			0.63			0.54	

Table 33 : Showing Teacher-Pupil Ratio in Low and High Drop-out Areas

Teacher-Pupil ratio in	*Low Drop-out Areas*	*High Drop-out Areas*
Single Teacher Schools	1:52	1:52
Multi-teacher Schools	1:33	1:42
Higher Primary Schools	1:39	1:49
Both LPS & HPS together	1:41	1:48

Table 34 : Showing Enrolment Figures in Primary Schools of Low and High Drop-out Areas.

Enrolment in	*Low Drop-out Area*	*High Drop-out Area*
Single Teacher Schools	679	1095
Multi-teacher Schools	848	463
All LPS (ST+MT)	1527	1558
Higher Primary Schools	3695	4459

Table 35 : Showing Incentives Schemes in Force During 1979-80 in Schools of Low and High Drop-out Areas

	Low Drop-out Areas			*High Drop-out Areas*				
	LPS	*HPS*	*Total*	*LPS*	*HPS*	*Total*	*Total LPS+ HPS*	*Percent age*
Mid-day meals	6	9	15	15	9	24	39	49
Free supply of text books	8	4	12	7	9	16	28	35
Attendance scholarships	1	1	2	2	5	7	9	11.3
Pre-matric scholarships	—	5	5	—	10	10	15	44
Merit scholarships	—	1	1	—	5	5	6	18
Backward class scholarships	—	6	6	—	2	2	8	24
Physically Handicapped	—	1	1	—	1	1	2	25
Labourers children	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ex-servicemen	1	4	5	—	4	4	9	11.3
Any other	1	1	2	3	6	9	11	15

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

A STUDY OF SCHOOL DROP-OUTS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS PARENTS' SCHEDULE

SECTION A

1. Schedule No :
2. Date of recording :
3. Name of village :
4. Name of taluka :
5. Name of the drop-out :
6. Name of the school :
7. Name of the father/guardian :
8. Standard from which dropped out :
9. When did he/she drop out ?

   this years, one year ago, two years ago, three years ago, four years ago, five years ago, more than five years ago.
10. Medium of instruction in the school while he/she was studying ?

    English, Kannada, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu, Malayalam any other ( )
11. Father's/guardian's educational level :

    Illiterate, able to read and write, primary education, secondary education, higher education, technical education, professional education.

12. Father's/guardian's occupation :

Unskilled labour, skilled labour, retail business, service, owning land, cultivating land, agricultural labourer, share cropper, bonded labourer.

(Note the name of the occupation and nature of work also).

13. Experience in occupation : (note the No. of years)

14. Experience in other occupation : (note the No. of years).

15. Father's/guardian's annual income :

Below Rs. 500, Rs 501 to 1000, Rs. 1001 to 2000, Rs, 2001 to 3000, Rs. 3001 to 4000, Rs. 4001 to 5000, Rs. 5001 to 10000, Rs. 10001 to 15000, and above

16 Distance from home to place of father's work :

17. Extent of landholding (in acres) :

Wet land............Dry land..........Garden.. ....

18. Whether marginal farmer/small farmer/big farmer/ agricultural labourer.

19. If owning lands, main crops grown........... ......
(Consumer crop/commercial crop)

20. Production during the previous year..... ....

21. Other crops grown in the land ....

22. Livestock position :

Hens.......... ... Sheep.............. Goats.... ....
Pigs.............Cows .. ..Baffaloes ....

23. Number of oxen at home .. .. owned/hired

24. Mother's educational level :

Illiterate, able to read and write, primary education, secondary education, higher education, technical education, professional education.

25. Mother's occupation :

Unskilled labour, skilled labour, services, retail business, housewife

(Note the name of the occupation and nature of work also).

26. Experience in occupation : (note the No. of years).

27. Experience in other occupations : (note the No. of years)

28. Mother's annual income ;

Below Rs. 500, Rs. 501 to 1000, Rs. 1001 to 2000, Rs. 2001 to 3000, Rs. 3001 to 4000, Rs. 4001 to 5000, Rs. 5001 to 10000, Rs. 10001 to 15000, Rs. 15001 and above.

29. Distance from home to place of mother's work :

30. Number of children at home :

Sl. No.	*Sex*	*Age*	*Educational level*	*Occupation*
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

(Note : encircle the drop-out under study)

31. Order of birth of the drop-out ?

1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th.

32. Has any other child in your family dropped out of school ? Yes/No
33. If Yes to Q. 32 note the following :

    (about only those drop-out children who are below 14 years of age at present).

Sl. No.	*Age*	*Sex*	*Standard from which dropped out*
1.			
2.			
3.			

34. Are you engaged in any home industry ? Yes/No (Note the nature of home industry)
35. If Yes, to Q. 34, annual income from the same :
36. Religion : H/C/M/J/B/P
37. Caste : *(a)* SC/ST/BC/Others (specify)

    (b) Denomination
38. Acceptance of family welfare programme : Sterilised (father/mother) not sterilised
39. Have you taken loans ? Yes/No
40. If Yes to Q. 30 specify the amount :
41. Mother tongue :

    Kannada/Tamil/Telugu/Urdu/Malayalam//Others (specify)
42. Health of the father : Good/Average/Bad/Critical.
43. Health of the mother : Good/Average/Bad/Critical
44. Whether joint family/nuclear family ?
45. If joint family

    No. of persons at home........................ ......

    No. of persons working..................................

46. No. of members in the family ?

    Adults : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
    Children : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

47. No. of earning members in the family ?

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

48. Do you own a house/houses ? or live in a rented house ?

    Remarks of the Investigator about the facilities (if any).

49. Living accommodation :

    (*a*) No. of rooms : 1 2 3 4
    (*b*) Bathing facility : Yes/No
    (*c*) Latrine : Yes/No
    (*d*) Electricity : Yes/No
    (*e*) Street tap : Yes/No
    (*f*) Common well : Yes/No
    (*g*) Well : Yes/No
    (*h*) Bore well : Yes/No
    (*i*) Street light : Yes/No

50. Distance of the school from home :

    Walkable within 5 mts, 10 mts, 15 mts, 20 mts, 25 mts, 30 mts, more than 40 mts.

SECTION B

51. Duties of the drop-out inside the home :
    Looking after younger children, filling water, cooking, work assistance to father/mother, cleaning the house, cleaning the vessels, washing clothes, nothing.

52. Duties of the drop-out outside the home :
    Looking after cattle/pigs/poultry/collect cow-dung/collect firewood/shopping/work assistance to father/mother/nothing.

53. No. of hours of duties inside the home :
1 hr, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 more than 8 hours.

54. Time of duties of the drop-out ?
Morning, afternoon, evening.

SECTION C

I. Drop-outs engaged in agricultural labour

55. What is the wage rate in your area ?

Man..........., Woman.............., Child..............
(note down the type of field in which this wage rate is in force)

56. Does the employer give food ?
Yes/No

57. If Yes to Q. 56, how many times is the food provided in a day ?

Once, twice, thrice (note down whether morning, after-noon, evening)

58. How much does the child get employment ?
Regularly, frequently, occasionally.

59. How much does the child earn on an average ?
(p.a.)
Below Rs. 100, Rs. 101 to 200, Rs. 201 to 300, Rs. 301 to 500, Rs. 501 to 750, Rs. 751 to 1000, Rs. 1001 to 1500, Rs. 1501 to 2000, Rs. 2001 and above.

60. What do you do with money ?
Spend on family maintenance, spend on the drop-out/children, purchase cattle/household articles, save, others (specify)

61. Will it not be possible for you to maintain the family without sending the child for agricultural labour ?
Yes/No

II. Drop-outs engaged in paid non-agricultural work

62. Is/was the drop-out engaged in paid work ?
Yes/No

63. If Yes, to Q. 62 note down the nature of work.

64. If engaged in paid work,
Is it full time/part time/ occasional

65. (*a*) No. of hours of work of the drop-out in paid work

1 hr, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 more than 8 hours.

(*b*) Time of duties :
Morning, afternoon, evening

66. Distance of the village from place of work ?

Within 1 km, 2 kms, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, more than 10 kms.

67. If the distance is long, how does he commute to the place of work ?

(long means more than 5 kilometres)

By walk, by bus, by bicycle, any other (specify)

68. How much money does the drop-out earn per month when he does paid work ?

Less than Rs. 5, Rs. 26 to 50, Rs. 51 to 75, Rs. 76 to 100, Rs. 101 to 150, Rs. 151 to 200, Rs. 201 to 250, more than Rs. 250.

69. What do you do with the money earned by the drop-out ?

spend on family maintenance, spend on the drop-out; purchase cattle/household articles/save, others (specify)

70. Will it not be possible for you to maintain the family without sending the child for paid work ?
Yes/No

III. Drop-outs who are bonded labourers

71. Is your child a bonded labourer ?
Yes/No

72. If yes, for how much money................and for how many years............you have mortgaged him ?

(Specify the amount and the years in the dotted lines provided)

73. What do you do with his money ?

spend on family maintenance, spend on the children purchase cattle/household articles, save, others (specify)

74. To whom have you mortgaged him ?

Note the relation of the person to the parent.

SECTION D

75. *(a)* Did the drop-out fail in any class ?
Yes/No

(b) If Yes, to Q. 75 *(a)* note the standards in which he failed ?
I, II, III, IV, V, VI

(c) Note the number of times he failed ?
1, 2, 3, 4

76. Reasons for failure :

Ill-health, work at home, work outside the home, poor memory, lack of comprehension abilities. irregular attendance.

77. Reasons for irregularity in attendance :

Lack of interest in class work, work at home, work outside the home, peer group influence, health status of the child, unsuitable medium of instruction.

78. Is the drop-out physically handicapped/normal person ?

79. If he is physically handicapped, state the nature of handicap ?

    Stammering, lame, cannot use hands, poor eye sight, poor hearing.

SECTION E

Dowry and Drop-outs

Question that follow are only for girl drop-outs.

80. How much money on an average do you have to spend for the marriage of your daughter ?

    Below Rs. 1000, Rs. 1001 to 2000, Rs. 2001 to 3000, to Rs. 3001 to 5000, Rs. 5001 to 8000, Rs. 8001 to 10000, Rs. 10001 to 12000, Rs. 12001 to 15000, more than Rs. 15000.

81. Do you have to pay dowry for the marriage ?
    Yes/No.

82. If Yes to Q. 81 how much does the bridegroom's party normally demand ?

    Below Rs. 500, Rs. 501 to 1000, Rs. 1001 to 2000, Rs. 2001 to 3000, Rs. 3001 to 4000, Rs. 4001 to 5000, more than Rs. 5000.

83. Is the amount of dowry for a graduate higher than that for a non-graduate ?
    Yes/No.

84. Is there a difference in the dowry rates between a bridegroom employed in the service of Government and one who is unemployed ?
    Yes/No.

    (If it is discovered that dowry has to be paid during marriages in the drop-outs' family and it varies with the educational level of the bridegroom then ask the following questions) :

85. Is it because you may have to pay dowry that you withdrew your child from school ?
Yes/No.

86. Is it necessary to give primary education to girls ?
Yes/No.

87. If Yes, then why did you allow your daughter to drop-out ?

SECTION F

Common to all parents of drop-outs

88. Does the teacher(s) come to the school regularly ?
Yes/No.

89. Did your child learn anything at school ?
Yes/No.

90. Does the teacher beat children ?
Yes/No.

91. If yes to Q. 90, is it the reason for your child to drop-out of school ?
Yes/No.

SECTION G

92. Do you know that the Government gives special educational facilities/incentives for primary school going children ?

(Especially girls and scheduled castes children)

Yes/No.

If Yes,

93. Mention a few that you know of :
(Tick the schemes given by the respondent from the list below)

Mid-day meals schemes, free supply of text books, attendance scholarships, pre-matric scholarships, merit scholarships, any other (please specify).

94. How did you become aware of this/these schemes ?
Through HM, school teacher, neighbour, village leader, cannot say.

95. What do you know about the scheme ?

The investigator has to check whether the parent just knows, knows partial details, knows full details, about the scheme.

96. Have any of your children benefited in the past ?
Yes/No.

97. Why did your child drop-out of school ?
(give specific reasons).

98. Do you think it is necessary to give primary education ?
Yes/No.

99. If no, is it not necessary even for boys ?
Yes/No.

APPENDIX II

SCHOOL SCHEDULE

1. Schedule No : Date of Visit :
2. Name of the Institution :
3. Total strength of the school (80—81) :

Boys		*Girls*	
SC & ST	*Others*	*SC & ST*	*Others*

4. Name of the Village :
5. Name of the Taluka :
6. Name of the District :
7. Location :
   - (*a*) Location of the Village :

     On the main road/near the main road (within 1/2 a km)/far away from the main road.
   - (*b*) Location of the school :

     in the village/near the village (within 1/2 a km) far away from the village.
8. Pucca Road/Kutcha Road to the village
9. Type of institution :
   - (*a*) Government

(*b*) Private—Aided/Unaided

(*c*) Girls/Boys/Co-educational

(*d*) Single teacher/two teacher/multi teacher

(*e*) No. of standards in the school :
I—IV, V—VII, I—VII MPS/any other

10. Staff : (state the number in each column) :

	Male	*Female*	*Total*	*Trained*	*Untrained*
S C					
S T					
Others					
Stipendary					
Part time					
Residing in the village					
Commuting from outside					
Total					

11. Years of service : (state the number in each column)

	Less than 2 years	*2 yrs to less than 5 years*	*5 yrs to less than10 years*	*10 yrs to less than 20 years*	*20 yrs and above*
Male					
Female					
Total					

12. No. of graduate teachers in the school ?

13. Media of instruction : Kan/Tamil/Telugu/English/ Malayalam/Hindi/Urdu/ others (specify)
14. Year of starting the school :
15. School timings :
16. Building : (*a*) Pucca/Kutcha
    (*b*) Tiled roof/RCC/Asbestos/Thatched/ any other (specify)
    (*c*) Rented/Owned/Donated/ Religious / place (temple, church, mosque, etc.)
    (d) with a compound without a compound
    (e) any other (specify)
17. Accommodation : *(a)* No. of class rooms
    (b) No. of other rooms
    (c) No. of halls (if any)
    (d) with a HM's/without a HM's room
    (e) with a staff/without a staff room
18. See Annexure—I (1977-78)
19. See Annexure—II (1978-79)
20. See Annexure—III (1979-80)
21. No. enumerated under CPE in December 1979.

	Out of them			*No. enrolled in schools*			*Reasons for not enrolling other children*
	Boys	*Girls*	*Total*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	
S C							
S T							
Others							
Total							

22. *(a)* Is there a school betterment committee ?
    Yes/No.
    (b) If yes state the total number of members in the committee.
    (c) How often does the committee meet in a year ? Once, Twice, Thrice, Four times and more than that.
    (d) What is the attendance of members at these meetings ?
        (i) less than 25%
        (ii) 25 to 50%
        (iii) 51 to 75%
        (iv) 76% and above.

23. Nature of assistance given by the committee
    (a) *(i)* through cash
        (ii) through kind
    (b) if cash *(i)* how much ? (79-80)
        (ii) Mention the heads under which this amount was used and specify the amount used under each head in the bracket ?
    (c) Kind
        (i) clothes/furniture/library books/play materials/building/any other (specify)
        (ii) what is the approximate cost of these materials ?

24. State (if any) public contribution to :
    (a) Uniforms/text books/scholarships to children/mid-day meals/any other (specify)
    (b) Building construction/repair
    (c) Any other (specify).

25. Incentive schemes implemented in the school ?
    (a) Mid-day meals

(*b*) Free supply of text books, slates, stationeries etc.

(*c*) Attendance scholarship

(*d*) Pre-matric scholarship

(*e*) Merit scholarship

(*f*) Scholarship for backward class children

(*g*) Scholarship for physically handicapped

  (*i*) Central

  (*ii*) State

(*h*) Scholarship for labourers' children (welfare commissioner(s)

(*i*) Scholarship for ex-servicemen's children

(*j*) Any other (specify).

26. No. of beneficiaries of the above incentives schemes during 1979-80 (refer Annexure-IV).

27. Make a note of the other assets of the school and how they are used (for *eg*. land, building, etc.).

28. What problems do you face in running of the school ?

If the school is a high drop-out institution, ask.

29. Why do children drop-out from your school ?

30. (*a*) Have you taken any measures to check drop-out in your school ?
Yes/No

(*b*) If Yes, state how they are being carried out.

31. (*a*) Have you made any special efforts to seek the co-operation of public to check drop-outs in your school ?
Yes/No.

(*b*) If Yes, state how your efforts are being met with ?

Satisfactory, fairly satisfactory, not satisfactory (justify your response with details)

If the school is a low drop-out institution.

32. What do you think are the reasons for high retention of children in your school ?

33. What is the nature of public participation in your area with the school ?

    Highly interested, fairly interested, not interested (specify your response with details)

School Equipment check list (State the No.)

1. Black Board :

   Wall
   Stand
   Without stand
   Rolling
   Any other (specify)

2. Seating arrangement :

   Floor
   Benches
   Benches attached with desks
   Planks attached with desks/wooden planks
   Any other (specify)

3. Furniture for staff :

   Chairs
   Tables
   Cup boards/Almirahs
   Any other (specify)

4. Maps :

   World
   Continent
   Other countries :
   India
   State

District
Taluka
Village

5. Charts :

Alphabets
Number
Animals
Flowers
Birds
Life science
Mathematics
Social Studies
Civics
Health/Hygiene
Story telling
Time charts
Season charts
Any other (specify)

7. Pictures :

National leaders
State leaders
School photos

8. Teaching Aids :

Models :

(*a*) Science
(*b*) Mathematics
(*c*) Social studies
(*d*) Any other (specify)

9. Wall clock

10. Time piece

11. Play Materials

(*a*) indoor (specify)
(*b*) outdoor (specify)

12. Physical Education :
    - (*a*) Lezeams
    - (*b*) Dumb-bells
    - (*c*) Rings
    - (*d*) Hoops
    - (*e*) Sticks
    - (*f*) Any other (specify)
13. Sports Materials (specify)
14. Library books :
    - Text books
    - Reference books
    - Fiction
    - Others (specify)
15. Other Facilities :
    - Drinking water
    - Lavatory
    - Play Ground
    - Garden
    - Cooking Room
    - Staff Room
    - Store Room
    - Any other (specify)
16. Co-curricular Activities :
    - Debate
    - Music
    - Drama
    - Essay writing
    - Drawings and Paintings

Science exhibition

Any other (specify)

Note : Find out the school's participation in the above activities at the Taluka/District/Divisional State/National/International levels

17. Scouts
    Guides
    Red cross
    Any other (specify)

ANNEXURE I—II—III

	No. enrolled in 197				*No. appeared in 19*				*No. dropped out (19) with percentage in brackets*			
	B		*G*		*B*		*G*		*B*		*G*	
	SC & ST	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*
I												
II												
III												
IV												
V												
VI												
VII												
Total												

Oth = Others.

Note : This information was collected for the years 1977-78, 1978-79 and 1979-80 in separate stencil-typed pages.

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

	No. passed in				Percentage of failure			
	B		G		B		G	
	SC & ST	Oth	SC & ST	Oth	SC & ST	Oth	SC & ST	Oth
I								
II								
III								
IV								
V								
VI								
VII								
Total								

ANNEXURE IV

26. No. of beneficiaries of the above incentives schemes during 1979-80.

Name of the scheme	*I*				*II*				*III*				*IV*			
	B		*G*		*B*		*G*		*B*		*G*		*B*		*G*	
	SC & ST	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*	*SC & ST*	*Oth*
I																
II																
III																
IV																
V																
VI																
VII																
VIII																
IX																
X																
Total																

Oth=Others.

(Contd.)

(Contd.)

Name of the scheme	V				VI				VII			
	B		G		B		G		B		G	
	SC & ST	Oth	SC & ST	Oth	SC & ST	Oth	SC & ST	Oth	SC & ST	Oth	SC & SC	Oth
I												
II												
III												
IV												
V												
VI												
VII												
VIII												
IX												
X												
Total												

Oth=Others.

APPENDIX III

Sample of villages selected for the pilot study

Name of the village	*Name of the taluka*	*Name of the district*	*Name of the region*	*Area of drop-out*	*No. of schools covered*	*No. of households covered*
Gujjadi Gangolli	Coondapur	South Kanara	Coastal	High	3	28
Kollur, Sanoor	Karkala	South Kanara	Coastal	Low	2	23
Moodabidri Devaragonal	Shorayur	Gulbarga	Dry	High	1	8
Karegud	Deodurg	Raichur	Dry	Low	1	10
Kakotupurambu	Virajpet	Coorg	Hilly	Low	1	12
Cholanaikanahally	Magadi	Bangalore	I B	Low	2	23
Total						104

APPENDIX IV

Details of the sample for the main study

Name of the Area/District/Taluka	*Area of Drop-out*	*No. of villages selected for the study*			*Total*	*No. of schools selected*	*No. of households covered*
		with H S	*with M S*	*with P S*			
A. **Dry Area**							
1. Bidar, Humnabad	H D A	1	2	3	6	6	241
2. Bijapur, Mudebihal	L D A	1	3	3	7	7	253
B. **Wet Area**							
1. Belgaum Gokak	H D A	1	2	3	6	7	175
2 Mandya Pandavapura	L D A	1	2	4	7	7	238
C. **Coastal Area**							
North Kanara							
1. Bhatkal	H D A	1	2	2	5	14	251
2. Honavar	L D A	1	2	2	5	13	193

(Contd.)

(Contd)

Name of the Area/District/Taluka	*Area of Drop-out*	*No. of villages selected for the study*			*Total*	*No. of schools selected*	*No. of households covered*
		with H S	*with M S*	*with P S*			
D. Hilly Area							
1. Shimoga, Thirtahalli	H D A	1	2	5	8	8	148
2. Coorg, Mercara	L D A	1	1	3	5	6	91
E. Industrial Belt							
Bangalore							
1. Nelamangala	H D A	1	2	4	7	7	138
2, Kolar, Bangarpet	L D A	1	1	4	6	5	150
Total		10	19	33	62	80	1878

LIST OF VILLAGES SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

Name of the District	*Name of the Taluka*	*Name of the Village*
1	2	3
1. Bidar	Humnabad	1. Bhimalkheda
		2. Sindhankhera
		3. Kumarchinehalli
		4. Othgi
		5. Madaragoon
		6. Bothgi
2. Bijapur	Muddebihal	1. Tangadogi
		2. Kalagi
		3. Kesapura
		4. Alkoppara
		5. Devoor
		6. Nagaral
		7. Kamaldinne
3. Belgaum	Gokak	1. Yadavad
		2. Waderatti
		3. Maladinni
		4. Balobal
		5. Dandapur
		6. Ajjanakatti
4. Mandya	Pandavapura	1. Chinkurali
		2. Sunkathannur
		3. Bevinakuppe
		4. Haralahalli
		5. Kalenahalli
		6. Kanagonahalli
		7. Doddabhoganahalli
5. North Kanara	(*i*) Bhatkal	1. Shirali (II)
		2. Bailur
		3. Chowthani
		4. Hadhin
		5. Nuez

1	2	3
	(*ii*) Honavar	1. Hosakuli
		2. Nagarbastikeri
		3. Vandoor
		4. Saralgi
		5. Adkar (Melin-Mudkani)
6. Shimoga	Thirthalli	1. Basavani
		2. Hosa Agrahara
		3. Huthalli
		4. Naratoor
		5. Mallesara
		6. Nallisara
		7. Demlapura
		8. Bobli
7. Coorg	Mercara	1. Mutharmudi
		2. Nelaji
		3. Katakeri
		4. Hakathur
		5. Arvathoklu
8. Bangalore	Nelmangala	1. Shivagange
		2. Varagoor
		3. Kodagibommanahalli
		4. Kadabagere
		5. Halkur
		6. Kodihalli
		7. Ravathanahalli
9. Kolar	Bangarpet	1. Boodikote
		2. Peddachinnapalli
		3. Thatepalli
		4. Koolur
		5. Chalaganahalli
		6. Yethoor

INDEX

A

A. S. Seetharamu 4
Assets of the School 79

B

Bombay Municipal Corporation 4

C

Chandra Shekharan Mrs. 4
Child Labour and Drop-out Phenomenon 57, 101
C.L. Sapra 3
Community Participation 89, 112
Co-Curricular Activities 111

D

Distribution of Land 34
Drop-out behaviour when both Parents are employed 34
Drop-outs' World 44, 96
Drop-outs' 45, 53, 69, 98, 105
———in paid work 51
———in paid Non-Agricultural work 53, 99
———Dowry and 61, 105
———and their Ex-Teachers 69, 105
———in paid Agricultural work 98
D.S. Rawat 4
Duties of the Drop-out 45, 96 97
———in the House 45, 96
———outside the House 48, 97

E

Education of Parents 27
Education of Mothers 29
Education Attainment of the Family 29

F

Factors of Pressure 23
Family background of Drop-outs 27, 93
Failure in School and Drop-outs 65
Facilities for Physical Education 110
Frequency of Employment in paid Agricultural work 52, 98

H

Hartog Committee 4

I

Income Distribution and Drop-out Phenomenon 37
Income of the Drop-out 54, 99
Incentive Schemes as Educational Stimuli 65
Incentive Schemes and Drop-outs Rates 88
Incentive Schemes 111

K

Khandekar M 4

L

Land holding and Drop-out Phenomenon 33
Learning situation 24
Library books 87, 111
Low-High Variations 28, 33, 50
————Among Regions 32
Low-High and Regional Variations 36
Location of the village 76
Location of the school 76

M

M. Jayaraman 4

N

Non-School Factors 60

O

Occupation of fathers 31
Occupation of Mothers 32
Operational Definition of terms used 5

P

Parents' Occupation 31
Parents' Income 35
Parents' and their Drop-out children 67
Pictures 84
Play Ground Facility 85
Play Equipment 86, 111
Position of Black-Board in Lower Primary School 80
Position of Black-Board in Higher Primary School 80
Policy imperatives 93, 95, 101, 105, 112
Profile of School Covered 72, 106

R

Regional variations 18, 28, 46, 48, 50
Religion 40
Regional variations for Caste composition 42
Regional variations in Drop-outs' Income 55
Rural Area 5
Rural Poverty and Drop-out Phenomenon 38
Rural marriage Data in Drop-out Families 62

S

Satara Studies 4
School Drop-outs in Rural Areas 5
School Size 78, 108, 114
School Equipment in Rural Areas and Drop-out rate 79
School Equipment 114
Sex Variations 56, 100
Sex of Teachers 74
Seating Facility in Lower Primary School 81
S.L. Gupta 4
Social background of Drop-outs 40, 95
Stage of Schooling and Drop-out Phenomenon 15, 91
Sushila Bai 4

T

Teacher-Pupil Relation 73
Teachers' Place of Residence 75

Teachers by Length of Service 76
Teaching Aids 85, 110
Teacher Supply 113
Time of Duties of Drop-outs 49, 97
Training of Teachers 75
Type of Building 77

U

UNESCO 4

W

Where does the Drop-outs' Earnings 56, 100
Wall Clock and Time Piece in School 87

S.C.E.R.T., West Bengal
Library
Calcutta
25/3, B. C. Road

Form No. 3.

PSY, RES.L-1

Bureau of Educational & Psychological Research Library.

The book is to be returned within the date stamped last.

WBGP-59/60-5119C-5M

371.2913
SEE